THE CHRISTIAN EAST

VOL. II. NEW SERIES. NOS. 3 AND 4. WINTER, 1952–3

NOTES AND COMMENTS

BEFORE the spreading from Rome to the rest of the Christian world of the observance of the Winter Solstice (Natalis Dies Invicti Solis) as the feast of the Nativity of the Sun of Righteousness, Epiphany had been the feast alike of the Birth, of the Baptism, and of the First Miracle of our Lord. And so it remains with the Armenians. Elsewhere in the East, when December 25th was accepted for Christmas, January 6th became the festival of the Baptism—at once the Manifestation of the Trinity, and the hallowing of all nature in the Hallowing of the Waters. We publish here a translation of the great Prayer of St. Sophronius which forms the climax of this service in the Orthodox Church. In the West, the celebration at Epiphany of the Coming of the Magi appears to go back at least to St. Leo. The Baptism is relegated to the Octave: and even that observance is lost in the Anglican Calendar. But there are indications of an early Western observance of the Feast approximating to the Eastern. Fr. Boone Porter, a priest of the American Episcopal Church now reading for a research degree at Oxford, contributes a preliminary essay on this subject, which may have more importance than meets the eye for the understanding of our divergences, especially in regard to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

Alexandria

The Rt. Rev. F. F. Johnston, Anglican Bishop in Egypt, attended the Millenary Celebrations of the Greek Patriarchal Library as the representative of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

On Sunday, November 16th, 1952, he was present at a Doxology in the Patriarchal Church of St. Saba; the same evening he attended a Reception and Sacred Concert and on November 18th he represented His Grace at the Foundation of an Institute of Oriental Studies.

The messages sent by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York were much appreciated and were incorporated in a Book of Messages, a copy of which Dr. Mosconas, the Patriarchal Librarian, assured the Bishop would be sent to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The Millenary was celebrated amidst great enthusiasm on the part of the Greek community and aroused considerable interest generally.

The following is the letter sent on this occasion by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Archbishop of Mareotis, Athanasios, President of the Committee of the Millenary

Lambeth Palace, S.E. 1,

BELOVED BROTHER IN CHRIST, *5th March, 1952*

Thank you very much for your letter of February 14th. With great

pleasure I learned from it that this is the year of the millenary of the famous Library of the Patriarch of Alexandria. This brings to mind how, long before 952, Alexandria was an illustrious seat of learning graced by great Fathers of the Church at whose feet we still sit in gratitude and appreciation.

It is a miracle, for which we thank God, that the Church of Alexandria was able in the Tenth Century to light a beacon of learning in the dark world of that day. To keep it glowing for ten whole centuries is a remarkable achievement which reflects eternal credit on many faithful guardians of the treasures of learning. When we recall the great dangers you have been in, twice already during this century, especially in the last war, we give special praise to the protective hand of the Almighty. We in the Church of England, then, most gladly join with you in a heartfelt Te Deum Laudamus for the preservation of the priceless books and documents you have guarded for so long.

Looking to the future, I pray that your celebrations will proceed smoothly and happily and I assure you most warmly of my blessings on the work of your Library to promote sound learning in the Church, based on the wisdom of the Fathers and their followers.

I am,

Your sincere brother in Christ,

Sgd: GEOFFREY:

Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of All England and Metropolitan

THE RIGHT REV. ATHANASIOS,
Bishop of Mareotis,
President of the Committee of the Millenary of the
Library of the Patriarchate of Alexandria

Antioch

In publishing, as promised, an account by the Rev. Harold Embleton of the visit of the Metropolitan of Aleppo, we should express our appreciation of the great contribution to the success of the visit made by the writer, in hospitality and other ways—as also of the part played by the Central Office of Information.

The impression of sincerity, ability and spiritual force created by this young Archbishop—he is only 38, of Lebanese village provenance—is fully borne out by his record, both as Priest in Rio de Janeiro, where he was mainly responsible for the building of an Orthodox Church, and since his elevation to the see of Aleppo. We hear of his patronage and encouragement of the Orthodox Youth Movement working for a renewal of spiritual life in the Patriarchate of Antioch, especially in the Lebanon—several members of which have become known to us in this country while studying at the Russian Theological Institute in Paris in the last few years. Our guest, who had his theological education at Halki, visited Athens on his way to England.

Jerusalem

Good comes out of evil. It seems that the sufferings shared during the last tragic years have brought about a real reconciliation between Arabophone populace and Greek hierarchy in the Jerusalem Patriarchate; and that our old friend, the Patriarch Timotheos, has, in spite of his illness, played no small part in this. Co-operation between the two contrasted, but we trust no longer conflicting, elements is resulting at long last in the opening of a small seminary for the training of Orthodox clergy, Greek and Arab, at the Monastery of St. Demetrius in Jerusalem. This is excellent news. Our heartiest congratulations, good wishes and prayers go to all concerned. Jerusalem is a nerve-centre for Christendom, and no one can tell what great good for the Universal Church may grow from small beginnings there.

Greece

The information here given concerning the cession of Church lands in Greece may lead us to reflect back on events of no little importance in our own history and that of many other national Churches.

An Agreement was signed on September 18th, 1952, between the Church of Greece and the State for the cession by the former of wide areas of monastic lands—mainly pastures—which will be used for the settlement of landless peasants and small stockbreeders. Under the agreement four-fifths of the arable lands belonging to the Church and two-thirds of the pastures will be ceded, the Church receiving in part compensation a certain amount of urban property belonging to the Government, mostly in Attica. The agreement was signed on behalf of the Church by the Archbishop of Athens and All Greece and on behalf of the Government by the Ministers of Finance and Agriculture.

Mgr. Spyridon, Archbishop of Athens, in a statement issued after the signature, said that the Church was glad to be able to fulfil the promise given three years ago in reply to the appeal made by the King and to come to the assistance of many thousands of peasant families who would be settled on the monastic lands ceded to the State.

In this connection it is interesting to recall that in 1923–4 as a result of the evacuation from Asia Minor, the Greek Government found it necessary to expropriate against payment a number of large estates throughout the country, which included a considerable acreage of Church property.

As regards the lands belonging to the monastic establishments on Mount Athos these properties, as they were under the nominal control of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, were not expropriated but were taken over on long term leases and refugees settled on them.

No further expropriation since that date has taken place until the agreement of September 18th, 1952. The Church lands now taken over are chiefly marginal lands consisting of pasturage and low grade arable land.

In "Ekklesia" for October 1st, 1952, the Archbishop of Athens publishes his introductory statement to the agreement between Church and State for

the transfer of Church lands to unpropertied artisans. He emphasizes four points:

1. The material advantages accruing to the Church.
2. The fact that the agreement, for the first time, was arrived at not by "appropriation" by the State but by mutual consultation.
3. This imposes an obligation on the Church both to see that the landless are settled and that the land is properly exploited to the good of the community.
4. The assistance rendered by the Bishops of Corinth and Larisa, as well as by M. Tsatsos and the Minister for Economic Affairs, M. Mestikopoulos.

The Archbishop is satisfied that both ecclesiastical and communal interests have been served by a satisfactory end to long negotiations.

Jugoslavia

On December 10th last, speaking to the Council of Christians and Jews in London, the Archbishop of Canterbury voiced—as we think he was bound to do—the fears and scruples which many of us have felt in regard to the treatment of religious bodies in Yugoslavia, especially in view of the proposed visit of Marshal Tito to this country. He did it in the least provocative way possible, with no suggestion of a threat, advising against action by deputation, and content to leave the Foreign Secretary to find the most tactful way of making known to the Yugoslav authorities the feeling in this country. Even so, no one with knowledge of the traditional attitude of Orthodox Churches in such matters will be surprised at the Patriarch Vikentije's statement in reply. This is not an unfriendly statement. It even seems to suggest that, on the *lower* levels of the administration, some ground may have been given for the Archbishop's reference to "a pressure" on the Serb Orthodox Church "which in the last few months has become increasingly hostile." But it asserts that on the *higher* levels there has been a steady improvement. And it ends by insisting that "our friends can do the most for us by . . . allowing us to settle our affairs ourselves."

We publish both the relevant portion of the Archbishop's speech, and the extracts from Tanyug (the official Yugoslav News Agency) giving the gist of the Patriarch's statement and Foreign Minister Kardelj's comments thereon. The issues here raised are of primary importance. And it seemed worth while to invite an independent historian to discuss some of the general principles involved. Mr. George Kitson Clark, Fellow of Trinity College, and University Lecturer in History, at Cambridge, kindly consented to do this, and we are glad to be able to publish the result.

There is, of course, to be expected here a marked contrast between the Roman Catholic reaction to the problem and that of an Orthodox Church. The supernational organization of Rome makes external protest almost inevitable, although the results may be disastrous for Roman Catholics within the countries concerned. But the Patriarch Vikentije's attitude is the result of a lesson which the Orthodox have been learning ever since

the Church in the Mazdean Persian Empire found it expedient to adopt Nestorian heresy in order to distinguish itself clearly from the Church of the Romans; or since the Orthodox overrun by the Arab conquests recognized that the survival of their Church required of them loyalty to their Muslim overlords, and not to the Christian Emperors in Constantinople. It would be of great value if some Orthodox scholar could give us a full historical account of the unfolding of his Church's attitude in these matters.

Finland

The Bishop of Sheffield visited Finland in the course of the summer and, after an interval of five years, renewed his contact with the Orthodox Church there. This Church is in a lonely position. They have refused to come under the umbrella of the Patriarch of Moscow, and Constantinople is a long way off. They do keep in contact, however, with the Institute in Paris. The general position of the Church is much more stable than it was five years ago. The Lutherans have been friendly and relationships are good. They are faced with the difficulty, of course, of having many small groups of Orthodox country folk scattered all through Finland, some of whom may gradually drift into the Lutheran Church.

They are still handicapped by a shortage of books in their Theological Seminary.

St. Sergius' Theological Institute, Paris

We enclose a brochure received from the Orthodox Churches Aid Fund, with an urgent appeal for funds for the Institute. We fully endorse all that is said therein as to the importance of the Institute for all Christendom, and the very great work that it has accomplished over the last quarter of a century both in preserving an enlightened Orthodoxy in the Russian Emigration, and in familiarizing the West European world with Russian Orthodox thought not by any means confined to one school. We trust that the pan-Orthodox character of the Institute, stressed in the brochure, may be still further developed as time goes on, both in the staff and in the students. While it is, of course, desirable that none of us should allow the Institute to be his only window upon the Orthodox world, a very important window it must remain. Our debts to it are incalculable. We are glad to publish in this issue a paper by a student of the Institute, Herr Martin Jordan—a German whose Christian faith was restored by his experience of the Orthodox Church in the Ukraine during the War, and who himself joined the Orthodox Church two years ago.

The Ecumenical Movement

Professor Zander has produced a book, *Vision and Action: the Problems of Ecumenism.* And Fr. George Florovsky (also a Professor at St. Sergius' Institute until he went to America to become Rector of St. Vladimir's Academy in New York) has written a review of it in no uncertain terms. We publish this because it seems to us of great importance that it should be known that there are Orthodox whose active participation in the Ecumenical Movement has a very different *rationale* from that of Professor Zander. Will the latter be able to explain himself in such a way as to

modify some of Fr. Florovsky's criticisms? It should be taken into account that some of the offending statements expound only one side of a dichotomy, and the reviewer does not quote the balancing statements on the other side. At the same time, it is precisely this propensity to Hegelian dichotomies which appears to us one of the weakest points in the book. And we find it hard to understand how an Orthodox writer can loyally say (p. 30) that the one Christian Church *does not exist!*

One sentence in the review appears to us pivotal, so that on its justice or injustice the verdict on the book must depend: it is where Fr. Florovsky states, "It is precisely this spirit of *penitence* that is missing in the book we review."

We believe in outspokenness in such matters. But nothing said here diminishes the genuineness of our welcome to Professor Zander, who by the time these notes are published will be in this country again on a lecture tour which he has undertaken under the auspices of the Fellowship of SS. Alban and Sergius. Many will remember with gratitude his exposition of Orthodox worship when touring this country before the War in the company of the Choir of the Institute.

PRAYER OF ST. SOPHRONIUS OF JERUSALEM FOR THE HALLOWING OF THE WATERS AT EPIPHANY

O TRINITY, supreme in being, goodness and godhead; all-powerful, watching over all, invisible, inapprehensible; Artificer of the intellectual essences and the rational natures; innate Goodness; *Light unapproachable that lightest every man that cometh into the world;* shine on me too, thy unworthy servant: lighten the eyes of my intellect, so that I may dare to raise in hymns thy measureless beneficence and power. May the prayer be acceptable that I offer for the people here standing; so that my faults may not hinder the presence here of Thy Holy Spirit. But allow me uncondemned to cry to Thee and say even now, O Thou exceeding Good: We glorify Thee, O master man-loving, Almighty, King before all worlds: we glorify Thee the Creator and Artificer of the Universe. We glorify Thee, O Son of God Only-begotten, who art from Thy Mother without father, and from Thy Father without mother. For in the previous Feast we saw Thee an infant; but in this present we see Thee in Thy fulness, our God made manifest, perfect of perfect God. For to-day the time of the Feast is upon us, and the choir of Saints makes Church with us, and Angels keep feast with men. To-day the Grace of the Holy Spirit, in form of a dove has descended upon the waters. To-day has dawned the Sun that sets not, and the world is illumined with the Light of the Lord. To-day the moon with those bright rays is brought together with the world to exceeding brightness. To-day the luminous stars with the gladness of their shining adorn the world of men. To-day the clouds drop rain of righteousness from heaven upon mankind. To-day the Uncreated accepts the laying on of the hands of His creature. To-day the Prophet and Forerunner approaches the Master; but stands before Him in trembling, seeing God's condescension unto us. To-day the springs of Jordan are changed

into healings by the Advent of the Lord. To-day with sacramental streams all Creation is watered. To-day the sins of men are washed away by the waters of Jordan. To-day Paradise is opened unto men, and the Sun of Righteousness illumines us. To-day the bitter water, as with Moses for the People, is changed to sweetness by the Advent of the Lord. To-day we have been released from the old lamentation, and as the New Israel have been brought through to safety. To-day we have been redeemed from the darkness, and are illumined with the light of God-knowledge. To-day the mist of the world is dispersed by the Epiphany of our God. To-day all Creation is lit with torches from above. To-day the error is brought to nought, and the coming of the Master builds for us a road of Salvation. To-day things above keep feast with things below, and things below converse with things above. To-day the sacred and great-voiced assembly of the Orthodox exults. To-day the Master presses to Baptism, that He may lead up manhood to the height. To-day the unbowed is bowed to His own servant, that He may set us free from slavery. To-day we have earned the Kingdom of Heaven. For the Lord's Kingdom shall have no end. To-day earth and sea have shared between them the joy of the world, and the world is filled with gladness. *The waters saw thee, O God, the waters saw thee and were afraid; Jordan was driven back,* beholding the fire of the Godhead coming down bodily and entering into it. *Jordan was driven back,* contemplating the Holy Spirit descending in the form of a dove, and flying about Thee. *Jordan was driven back,* seeing the Invisible seen, the Creator incarnate, the Master in form of a slave. *Jordan was driven back,* and *the mountains skipped,* beholding God in flesh; and *the clouds gave their voice,* marvelling at Him who was come, *Light of Light, Very God of Very God*: seeing to-day in Jordan a festival of the Master, and Himself engulfing in Jordan the death of disobedience, and the sting of error, and the bond of hell, and bestowing on the world Baptism of Salvation. Wherefore I also, thy sinful and unworthy servant, rehearsing the majesty of thy wonders, constrained with fear, cry to Thee in compunction: *Great art Thou, O Lord, and marvellous are thy works, and no word will be sufficient to sing of thy marvels* (thrice). For thou by thy volition didst bring all things from nothingness into being, and by thy might dost hold together the Creation, and by Thy Providence disposest the world. Thou from four elements didst fit together the Creation, and crownedst the cycle of the year with four seasons. At Thee all the intellectual Powers tremble. The sun sings thy praise, the moon glorifies Thee, the stars intercede with Thee, the light obeys Thee, the depths shudder at Thee, the fountains serve Thee. *Thou didst stretch out the heaven like a curtain.* Thou didst *establish the earth upon the waters.* Thou didst wall about the sea with sand. Thou didst pour out the air for breath. Angelic powers minister to Thee. The choirs of the Archangels worship Thee. The many-eyed Cherubim and the six-winged Seraphim, standing in a ring and flying about Thee, veil themselves in fear of Thy glory unapproachable. For Thou, being God within no line contained, and without beginning, and inexpressible, didst come upon earth, taking

the form of a slave, becoming in the likeness of men. For Thou didst not bear, O Master, in the bowels of Thy mercy, to behold the race of men usurped by the devil, but didst come and save us. We confess the Grace, we proclaim the Mercy, we hide not the benefaction. Thou didst set free the generation of our nature: Thou didst hallow a virgin womb by Thy birth. All Creation sang Thy praise at Thy Epiphany. For Thou, our God, wast seen upon earth, and didst move among men. Thou also didst hallow the streams of Jordan, sending down from Heaven Thy All-Holy Spirit, and *brakest the heads of the dragons* that had their holes therein. *Therefore do Thou, O Man-loving King, be present now too by the descent of Thy Holy Spirit, and hallow this water* (thrice), and give unto it the grace of Redemption, the blessing of Jordan. Make it a fount of incorruption, a gift of hallowing, loosing of sins, defence against diseases, deadly to demons, to the adverse powers unapproachable, filled with angelic strength; that all who draw from it and partake of it may have it for cleansing of souls and bodies, for healing of passions, for hallowing of houses, for every service suitable. For Thou art our God, who by water and Spirit didst renew our nature which was grown old with sin. Thou art our God who didst drown sin by water in the time of Noah: Thou art our God, who through the sea didst set free from slavery of Pharaoh the race of the Hebrews by Moses: Thou art our God, who didst *cleave the rock in the wilderness,* and *the water gushed out, and the streams overflowed,* and Thou didst satisfy Thy people when they were thirsting: Thou art our God, who by water and fire, at the hand of Elijah, didst deliver Israel from the error of Baal. *And now also, Master, do Thou hallow this water by Thy Holy Spirit* (thrice). Give to all who touch it, are anointed with it, or partake of it, hallowing, blessing, cleansing, and health. *And save, O Lord, thy servants, our faithful Kings* (thrice), and keep them under thy protection in peace. Subdue under their feet every enemy and foe: grant them their requests that are for their salvation, and life eternal. Remember, O Lord, our Archbishop N. and all the Priesthood, the Diaconate in Christ, and every priestly order, and the laity standing round, and those our brethren who for reasonable causes are absent: and have mercy upon them and us, according to Thy great mercy: that by means of the elements, and of angels, and of men, and of things seen, and of things invisible, Thy All-Holy Name may be glorified, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, now and ever and unto the ages of the ages. Amen.

Dismissal Hymn of the Epiphany

Thy Baptism in Jordan stream, O Lord
Revealed the worship of the Three-in-One.
The Father's voice in witness from above
Named Thee beloved Son.
And, bodied as a dove,
The Spirit sealed the sureness of that word.
O Christ, God there made manifest,
The world that lightenest,
Glory to Thee.

THE METROPOLITAN OF ALEPPO'S VISIT

The Most Rev. Elia Mouawad, Metropolitan of Aleppo, paid a visit to Great Britain from 1st to the 15th August, 1952, at the invitation of the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association. He arrived by air from Athens on Friday, 1st August, and was met at Northolt by the Rev. H. M. Waddams (on behalf of the Archbishop of Canterbury and of the Church of England Council on Foreign Relations) and by the Rev. H. Embleton (assistant to, and representing, the Rev. Austin Oakley, General Secretary of A. & E. C. A.), whose guest he was for the first weekend.

On the Saturday, after paying courtesy calls on the Lebanese and Syrian Legations, he was entertained to lunch by the Dean of Westminster, was shown round the Abbey, and attended Evensong in choir. On the Sunday he was present at the Holy Communion at St. John Baptist's Church, Wimbledon, before going on to the Liturgy at the Cathedral of the Holy Wisdom, at which he presided. On Bank Holiday Monday His Grace was taken by car to Canterbury, where he was the guest of the Chapter at lunch, attended Evensong in choir, and was entertained to tea by the Archbishop of Canterbury and Mrs. Fisher in the Old Palace. On Tuesday morning he left Wimbledon for Cambridge, stopping *en route* to attend Mattins in St. Paul's Cathedral. During this weekend he was able to meet and talk at length with the Rural Dean of Wimbledon, one or two of the parochial clergy, and several laypeople, and thus to catch a glimpse of life and movements in the Church of England at the parochial level.

During His Grace's visit to Cambridge, where he stayed at King's College with the Rev. H. M. Waddams, he was able to visit several colleges; he attended Evensong in King's College Chapel and dined at High Table in St. Catherine's and King's.

Thence to Ely, visiting the Land Settlement Scheme *en route*, where he was entertained to lunch by the Bishop of Ely and visited the Cathedral. From there he returned to London. Friday, 8th August, was taken up entirely by a visit to the Conference of the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius at Abingdon.

The next day, the Metropolitan went by train to York, where he was the guest of the Dean and where he had lunch with the Archbishop of York on the Monday. On the Tuesday, he toured Messrs. Rowntrees chocolate factory and had lunch with the Directors before returning to London.

For the remainder of the second week the Metropolitan was based on London, and made trips to Windsor, Oxford, Hampton Court, Lambeth Palace and the British Museum. On the 14th August His Grace was present at the Serb Church Reception in honour of the Metropolitan Nikolai Velimirovic. On 15th August the Metropolitan of Aleppo left Northolt to return to Beirut.

It will be appreciated that the fortnight's visit to England was an arduous one. Apart from the amount of travelling he had to do, he had also the strain of meeting and conversing with very many of our countrymen, from the Archbishops down, in (to him) a foreign language; but

although English was the least fluent of his five languages, he was too modest about his command of it. In field and factory, in city and village, in Cathedral and district church, the Metropolitan managed to see a microcosm of English life and thought, both civil and ecclesiastical. For this the Association is deeply indebted both to the Council on Foreign Relations (and particularly to the Rev. H. M. Waddams and the Rev. W. H. Macartney) and to the Central Office of Information (especially to Mr. R. W. Montford).

The Metropolitan admitted that all he had seen had caused him to change many of his preconceived ideas about the Church of England; and although some of his criticisms would have brought a blush to some of our English faces, on the whole he went away with a real admiration of, and affection for, our Church. He looked forward to a greater interchange between Anglican and orthodox theological students, and to more conferences between Anglican and Orthodox clergy and theologians, whereby the gulf between our two Communions might be narrowed and eventually bridged. "The Protestants" had no unity, and so with them it was impossible for the Orthodox Church to have any real relations; but "the Church of England was not 'Protestant' but in its own position": there was a danger in her having too close a contact with "Protestantism." At the same time the Metropolitan saw a danger in the "Romanism" in a section of the Church of England; "the Church of England should strive to build up and defend her own tradition."

The visit of the Metropolitan of Aleppo from the ancient Patriarchate of Antioch was yet another manifestation of the fellowship which has been built up slowly but surely between Anglicans and Orthodox, for which we humbly thank God and to which our Association is dedicated. "One Lord, One Church, One Faith" . . . Amen.

HAROLD EMBLETON.

CONDITIONS IN YUGOSLAVIA

Extract from the Speech of the Archbishop of Canterbury about Marshal Tito's forthcoming visit to England: together with the full text of the comments on it made by the Patriarch of the Serbian Orthodox Church, and also the comments of the Foreign Minister of the Yugoslav Government—Edvard Kardelj—upon the Patriarch's speech, translated from "Tanyug," the Official Yugoslav News Agency.

[From a Correspondent]

". . . But there is one matter of public interest, indeed of public concern, on which I desire to make some comments. I refer to the approaching visit to this country of Marshal Tito.

"The recent improvement in relations between Yugoslavia and the United Kingdom is something of which we may all be glad. In a world riven by strife as ours is, any developments which bring us into closer and more friendly contact with another country are to be welcomed; and this is particularly true of Yugoslavia for whose people the British people have

a long standing admiration and affection. Many still remember the glorious deeds of the Serbs in the first World War, and it will be long before we forget the great *coup d'état* of the 27th March, 1941, which brought Yugoslavia into the war on the side of the allies at a time when our fortunes were at a very low ebb.

"We hope that the forthcoming visit of Marshal Tito to this country will be an earnest that the good relations which at present exist between the Governments of our two countries will continue and increase and will contribute towards the peace and goodwill among all nations for which we pray. But it is necessary to say that our goodwill can hardly be secured or maintained so long as the Christian traditions of the peoples of Yugoslavia are being subjected to severe attack by governmental action. It is essential for good relations that the Yugoslav Government should fully recognize and carefully protect that freedom which in theory it permits to all religious bodies in its land so long as that freedom is legitimately employed.

"The Serb Orthodox Church has for some time been subjected to a pressure which has in recent months become increasingly hostile. The Government is, of course, avowedly anti-religious and therefore unsympathetic. But every principle of civilized order forbids that a Government should so interfere in Church affairs as to frustrate the proper freedoms of the Church and to compel its leaders and its members along the ways thought to be most acceptable to the State authorities. The Roman Catholic Church in Yugoslavia is no doubt more politically suspect in the eyes of the Government: it has not only been under the same kind of continuous pressure for a long time, but has been suffering active, open and severe persecution. Numbers of its clergy are in prison and its leaders are subjected to vicious attack in the Press. In a different field I understand that the British and Foreign Bible Society which has had freedom, subject only to severe financial conditions, to sell Bibles is threatened with the likelihood of having that freedom severely curtailed or indeed abolished in the near future.

"Such facts as these cause British people to be highly critical in their attitude to the Yugoslav Government, and all Christians to be acutely and bitterly aware of the sufferings imposed upon their Christian brethren by that Government. So long as this remains true, it obstructs the development of any real friendship between our two countries. It is necessary that Marshal Tito should be made aware of the fact that this feeling is very strong and very widespread here. I do not doubt that the Foreign Secretary will make him fully aware of it, and he will know best how to do it. And I am at present satisfied that the best thing is to leave him to do it rather than proceed by deputation. I sincerely hope that the Yugoslav Government will decide to right these wrongs, if not out of any sensitiveness or conviction of their own, yet as a contribution to international comity and understanding. For such action would beyond doubt have a heartening effect on British public opinion and would bring encouragement to all who are seeking to restore a stable and just civilization. It is right that I

should say so much here. For the very purpose of this Council [1] is to combat all forms of religious and racial intolerance wherever they exist."

To-day Vikentije Prodanov, Patriarch of the Serbian Orthodox Church, expressed reservation in connection with the statement of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. G. Fisher, made on December 10th at the Council of Christians and Jews in London when he spoke on religious conditions in Yugoslavia and dealt with relations between the Serbian Orthodox Church and the State.

"I deeply regret having to make this reservation," stressed the Patriarch in a statement published to-day in *Borba* and *Politika*. "No one authorized or asked His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury to discuss the relations between the Serbian Orthodox Church and the State at the annual meeting of Christians and Jews in London. Besides this we consider that neither the time nor the occasion have been suitably taken to discuss these matters. I shall not go into details, but I think that the answer imposes itself and that this will be realized in Great Britain," declared the Patriarch Vikentije Prodanov.

The Patriarch underlined that relations between the Serbian Orthodox Church and the State in Yugoslavia are characterized by gradual and steady improvement. "The Serbian Orthodox Church hopes that these relations will be gradually normalized. It always endeavoured on all occasions and at all times to be useful to the people and to satisfy national requirements. Churches full of people in Belgrade and in the interior of Yugoslavia are a proof of freedom of religious activity and of freedom of exercise of religious rites and festivities at which representatives of the Church of England have often been present," said the Patriarch, "show that religious life in Yugoslavia was developing on the whole normally."

The statement further says that there are some disagreements with lower bodies of the administration in the interior of the country who, perhaps owing to exaggerated "zeal," incorrectly apply the regulations, or owing to the fact that individual priests do not give sufficient attention to the new regulations of the Yugoslav authorities. However, both the higher Church and higher State authorities are endeavouring to smooth out inconsistencies. The Patriarch pointed out the fact that a great number of Orthodox priests were taking part in the political, cultural and economic life of the people. The State gives the Church subsidies and has concluded an agreement on social insurance with which the Church has been relieved of the anxiety over the payment of Church pensioners.

In conclusion the Patriarch stressed that the State not only did not prevent contact between the Orthodox Church and other Orthodox Churches and Christian Churches abroad, but helped in this connection, which is well known to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

"I consider I must specially emphasize also that the Serbian Orthodox Church has never in the past requested for a mediator between herself and the State authorities and is not doing so now, nor will do so in the future.

[1] The Council of Christians and Jews.

Our friends, if they wish us well, can do the most for us by leaving us in peace and allowing us to settle our affairs ourselves," concluded Patriarch Vikentije Prodanov.

"Tanyug"—*December 16th, 1952*

Foreign Minister Edvard Kardelj told the Assembly Foreign Policy Commission to-day that the Vatican had nominated Stepinac as Cardinal because it wanted to provoke Yugoslav public opinion and the Yugoslav Government and to prevent the State and a good part of the Catholic clergy from settling relations.

After having stated that Stepinac's nomination was part of the anti-Yugoslav campaign incited by the Vatican abroad in connection with Marshal Tito's visit to Britain at the invitation of the British Government, he referred to Patriarch Vikentije's reaction to the statement made by the Archbishop of Canterbury.

"The statement by the Archbishop of Canterbury on the persecution of both the Catholic and Orthodox Churches in Yugoslavia had the aim of proving to world public opinion that in Yugoslavia the Church is persecuted generally. However, the statement of the Patriarch of the Serbian Orthodox Church, Vikentije Prodanov, had added pure wine to the glass in a way that merits congratulations. With his statement, the Patriarch had demonstrated his patriotism towards the State and a feeling of responsibility for his country, for which the leading Catholic hierarchy was never prepared or was not allowed to be by the Vatican. In this way the statement by the Archbishop of Canterbury had demonstrated that the Vatican was the initiator of an anti-Yugoslav campaign, and that the Vatican was that factor which did not want normalization of the position of the Catholic Church in Yugoslavia.

Having emphasized that, owing to this situation, the Yugoslav Government was compelled to undertake more determined measures to clear the situation up in the country and abroad in this respect, Kardelj said that all churches in Yugoslavia are open and full, which proves that anti-religious propaganda in Yugoslavia has not been so active, and that no one is prevented from going to church, preach from the pulpits, teach religion in the churches. The churches publish religious literature. The Catholic bishops hold conferences from which they even sent sharp resolutions to the Government.

"Tanyug"—*December 18th, 1952*

A NOTE ON GENERAL PRINCIPLES

I have been asked to contribute these notes on the express grounds that I have no special knowledge of conditions in Yugoslavia, and must therefore necessarily discuss the matter as an issue of general reference without relation to the special circumstances of the problem in hand, or to statements of fact which are likely to be contested. Such a discussion of the matter may be unduly abstract, and its results may be commonplace; but

I attempt it in the hope that even the rehearsal of commonplaces may help to clear the mind.

The general problem involved is one with which we in this century are, alas, painfully familiar. It is this: What ought to be the attitude of Christians towards another country in which it is known or suspected that all fellow-Christians, or members of one particular Christian denomination, are either under persecution or, because they are Christian, enjoying less than their just rights as citizens? The natural reaction to such knowledge, or such suspicion, is generous and spontaneous: it is to protest at once, as publicly as possible; to try to urge one's own government to protest, and, obviously, to try to prevent it from entering into friendly relations with the government which has been accused. And the instinct which makes one wish to do all these things is one to be respected: to be respected, but possibly to be controlled: for it is possible that none of them may be the wisest and best actions in all possible circumstances. Apart from anything else, it must always be remembered that public protest, and in particular the denial of friendly relations, is most likely to prevent one's own country from having any influence whatever over the government of the country which has been accused: and in addition to this there would appear to be other circumstances to be taken into account before one can be certain what will be the results of such protests for the very people on whose behalf they are made.

The first of these is the need to gain accurate knowledge of local conditions. This is not easy. It is not easy nowadays to know precisely what is happening in many foreign countries, or what has happened, or the nature of what is likely to happen. It is even less easy to realize what may be the significance of a particular event in its local context. This does not of course mean that morality is ambulatory—that right and wrong change with latitude and longitude. Obviously an act of oppression or injustice remains an act of oppression or injustice wherever it is committed. But these matters are seldom without their reference to secular politics, and they are often coloured by past history of which those who frame the protest may be ignorant. As a result, what may seem in one country to be a natural protest against simple oppression may appear to the nationals of another country, and particularly to its government, to be an illegitimate attempt to interfere in their domestic politics in order to favour one party against the rest and against the state, and to be obviously directed towards some deep-seated objective in secular politics, which has in fact never crossed the minds of those who framed the protest three thousand miles away.

And this leads directly to what is perhaps the most important consideration of all. The primary object of such protests should be to improve the lot, or secure the safety, of those who may be suffering. This must be more immediately important than the general vindication of the moral law, and should transcend the simple human desire to indulge in the pleasures of moral indignation. Unless one's own government is in a position to interfere with crushing effect in the affairs of the accused country, and

more than that to continue to exercise an active surveillance over its administration, it is not at all impossible that the actual results of a public, and particularly an official, protest will be to worsen the lot of those on whose behalf it has been made. They will have become the clients of a foreign government: their activities will be the more suspect, and when opportunity serves it will be taken to cripple them still further. Nor, it must be confessed, is this attitude completely unreasonable; for it must be remembered that one of the most normal gambits of an aggressive foreign policy has been the claim to protect an oppressed group in another country against a government which it was desired to undermine.

Possibly in this context the tragic history of the Armenian nation in the last half of the nineteenth and the first quarter of the twentieth century ought to be rather carefully taken into consideration; not of course that I wish to suggest that conditions in modern Yugoslavia are likely to be comparable in any way to conditions in the old Turkish Empire; but I would claim that history at least urges caution on those who wish to express violent, but necessarily intermittent and possibly inoperative, sympathy in favour of a particular group in another country.

These are practical considerations. Behind them seems to be a more general point of principle. It is probably the duty of a Christian Church to accept, and to attempt to collaborate with, the government of the territory in which it finds itself, if it is at all possible to do so. I believe that this has been a principle which the Orthodox Church has normally adopted under very difficult conditions on the general grounds that the government which they had to accept represented, however imperfectly, the principle of order. It is difficult for those who have been brought up in the much easier conditions of Western Europe to accept this. To us a government seems to be illegitimate if it falls short of our minimum requirements of just administration, or is the government of foreigners, or at least denies to men the ultimate expectation of working out their own destiny. Where these conditions are absent we have been apt to canonize rebellion, and to believe that any Christian Church ought to do the same. But in the last resort, in conditions which the security of our recent history does not make it easy for us to envisage, it is not the primary duty of any Christian body to secure any of these excellent secular objects; its primary duty must be to administer the sacraments, and to teach the truths of religion to the faithful; and it must not take action which will lead it to be impeded in its task. The principle is not easy to apply; it has been the source of many bitter heart-burnings, many most difficult moral dilemmas; but it probably means that the Christian Church in any given territory must make its own terms with the government of that territory if it possibly can, and that foreign critics who attempt to disturb these terms accept a very serious responsibility indeed. It is therefore probably not desirable to interfere with any agreement there may be between the Orthodox Church in Yugoslavia and the government, though we must pray that such an agreement will be a satisfactory one.

This does not mean that black must ever be called white, or wrong

right. Perhaps the greatest danger to the morality of the world comes when we cease to call things by their proper names. Persecution, injustice, denial of reasonable civil liberties remain the evil things they are wherever they occur. If, for example, the present government of Yugoslavia is persecuting, or denying justice or spiritual liberty to, the Roman Catholics in Dalmatia or Croatia, it is very important that no man should be led by any political or diplomatic consideration to deny the fact; though in this matter it is still important to remember the practical considerations which were urged earlier on. In particular we need to know the facts more fully, and we want a criterion by which to judge them.

Indeed the whole matter would be easier to handle if its theory had been more systematically worked out, particularly in relation to the conditions of the twentieth century. What is needed is careful thought on the problem of what are the minimum conditions which any civilized government ought to concede to the religious bodies within its borders. The subject must be the duties of a civilized, not of a Christian, government, since many of the governments of the world nowadays are not Christian, and the rules should be universal and not simply a claim of privilege for Christians, still less for the members of any particular Christian denomination. The appeal must be to general principles of natural justice, which the Church may endorse, as it does endorse the natural principles of justice and humanity, but which will be valid for those who are not Christians. But emphasis on universals might in the last resort be more useful than spasmodic protests on particular instances which too often suggest, however unjustly, ulterior political motives, or are perhaps also liable to the suspicion, again possibly unjust, that men claim for their friends abroad a liberty which they would not grant to their opponents at home if in any way they could possibly avoid doing so.

It is not perfectly clear what these principles should be, at least in the socialist and semi-socialist states of the modern world. Presumably they would include the right of any man to entertain and propagate any sincerely held opinion without danger to his liberty or (what is now very important) his chance of employment and advancement in the state service: they must include the right of any Church to perform its spiritual functions without interference, and the right of parents to enable their children to be educated in their own beliefs: and this last right is going to be a very difficult one to guarantee in a world where most of the resources of a country, and all its facilities for education, are in the hands of the state. Any state clearly must have the power to put certain restrictions on the exercise of these rights in the name of public order and the common peace. This is an old problem, but it needs restatement. One point however is perfectly clear. No state can be expected to connive at its own destruction, and no government will give liberty to Christian leaders if they will seem to use it for teaching treason, or to serve as the agents of a secular foreign power. But perhaps it should be made clear that Christian principles by themselves are not likely to enjoin either domestic revolt or intrigue with a foreign secular power as part of the religious duties of the faithful.

G. KITSON CLARK.

LITURGY AS THE CONFESSION OF THE CHURCH

by MARTIN JORDAN

BEFORE entering on this subject it is necessary to explain certain terms. As is known, the word "liturgy" has several meanings. In Eastern Tradition the term "liturgy" means, in the first place, exclusively the eucharistic service. In Roman Catholic usage the term indicates a certain area within the religious life, the lawfully constituted territory of the "sacramentalia" and the canonical "hours." Outside this sphere of liturgical services, there is the wide territory of semi-liturgical devotions. Here, then, the word "liturgical" covers what the Russians mean by "*ustavnaja sluzhba.*" Finally, sometimes one uses the word "liturgical" or "liturgy" in a far wider sense—liturgy as denoting the whole religious life of the Church. Here I shall take the last usage: liturgy, simply as the religious life of the Church. We must understand that the centre of this life is necessarily the Eucharist; and the pattern of this life is based principally on the laws of the Church; on the liturgical patterns—which the Russians call "*Ustav.*"

The subject "Liturgy and Doctrine" * seems to me to admit several interpretations. First of all, one could think generally about the doctrinal substance of liturgical texts and actions. How far is our service, with all its biblical, historical and hagiographical readings, with the rich material of its prayers and hymns, in a certain sense a school? Certainly, this is an interesting and complex question, but it would lead us too far. On the other hand, we can also express our subject "Liturgy and Doctrine" as a wish to clarify the relation between the doctrinal and the liturgical element in the life of the Church. So we would have to clarify the relation between word and sacrament, proclamation and prayer, catechesis and baptism, preaching and Eucharist. The problem of how to preserve the balance between these two elements is a most fruitful subject of study, as is the closely related theme of their interrelation one to another in the day-to-day life of an ordinary parish. But I think we can make a still deeper approach to the question contained in our subject "Liturgy and Doctrine." I should like to try to demonstrate this as follows:

In St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians (i. 3) we find two definitions of the Church. In the first chapter we read that the Church is the Body of Christ, which means the fulness of Him, who fills everything everywhere with His Presence. And in the fifth chapter we find the Church as the Bride of Christ.

As the body is the complement of the head, so are we, as members of the Church, the fulness of our all-embracing Head, Jesus. We are His Body: "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ" (Gal. iii. 27). And it is one Bread which we eat, the true Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and therefore we are one Body. As members of the Body of Christ we have to carry out Christ's Plan in the world. We have to speak His Word to the world. We have to give place to Him, who is

* The general subject of the second part of the annual conference of the Fellowship of SS. Alban and Sergius (1952), at which this paper was read.

speaking through us. Only then can we claim for ourselves as men the right to speak to the world as the Church, as members of the Body of Christ, as instruments and agents of the Divine Head passing on His Word —not our own—to our brothers.

This is the meaning of the Church: "Ye shall be witnesses unto me" (Acts i. 8). But the Church is not only the Body, she is also the Bride of Christ. She is not only the passive mouthpiece by which He speaks. As the Bride she can say as it were her personal "Yes" to His Word, to the Word of Her Bridegroom. The Church is not only enabled to proclaim, but also to confess. As Bride she finds herself face to face with Her Lord and Bridegroom. He speaks to Her and is waiting for Her "Yes." The possibility is given to the Church of frankly saying "yes" in her own strength in reply to God's call through Christ—not more and not less than a modest but clear "yes": "Yea, Lord, I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God" (St. John xi. 27). This is the content of the Church's confession. This possibility of saying "yes," this possibility of answering Christ is given to the Church by the Holy Spirit: "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Spirit" (1 Cor. xii. 3). "When the Comforter is come . . . the Spirit of Truth . . . he shall testify of me" (St. John xv. 26). "He will glorify me, for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you" (St. John xvi. 14).

The Church as the Body of the Lord extends the proclamation across the world: "The kingdom of heaven is near" (St. Matt. iii. 2). But at the same time, as the Bride, in whom and through whom the Spirit is giving answer to the Word, she is speaking her "yes" to the message. The Spirit and the Bride say: "Come, . . . Amen, come Lord Jesus" (Rev. xxii. 17–20). Through the Spirit our answer is made possible, the response of the creature to the direct approach of the Creator. Through the Spirit and only through the Spirit is made possible our confession and our prayer: ". . . the spirit assists us in our weakness; . . . and pleads for us with sighs that are beyond words . . ." (Rom. viii. 26). Our prayer is only prayer, when it is a partaking of the sighing of the Spirit, a praying together with the Spirit. Our confession is only real confession when it happens in the Spirit and through the Spirit. Similarly, our proclaiming only becomes the real proclamation, when it is Christ our Head who speaks through us. Christ it is who proclaims, the Spirit who prays and confesses. Only by keeping this in mind can we have a right attitude towards the life of the Church, towards her proclaiming and confessing, her doctrine and devotion, her service and her liturgy.

We cannot separate Christ from the Spirit, the Spirit from Christ, the Church as the Body from the Church as the Bride, the Word of Christ *through* the Church from the Word of the Spirit *in* the Church. The unity of this "face to face" is ultimately founded on the unity of essence of the Three Persons in the Holy Trinity and even so—now in this context here—on the unity of the Second and the Third Persons of the Holy Trinity—of the Son and the Spirit—of the Word and the Paraclete. Even in this unity remains, nevertheless, the real "face to face," the real tension which is

founded on the two Hypostases—of Word and Paraclete. And in this tension lives the Church of the Spirit.

The life of the Church, her Ministry, her Magisterium and her Priesthood, her Doctrine and her Liturgy are only comprehensible to us, if understood in the midst of this tension. All the Church's proclamation of the Message of the Kingdom of God, is the Word of Christ through us; all the Church's action is in the same way confession by the Holy Spirit, responding to and affirming the Word of God addressed to us.

The Church is founded by Christ at the Last Supper (but realized at Pentecost). Let us say, the Church, according to her very essence, is properly speaking nothing else than the extension throughout space and time of the Table of this Meal of Jesus with His disciples. If one takes this one and final Eucharistic Meal out of the Church one takes her all. This corresponds with the end of the silent prayer spoken by the priest after the Thrice Holy in St. Basil's Liturgy: " . . . he hath left us, as memorials of his saving Passion, these Things which we have spread forth according to his commandment. For when he was about to go forth to his voluntary, and ever-memorable, and life-creating death, in the night in which he gave himself for the life of the world, he took bread in his holy and stainless hands, and when he had shown it unto thee, his God and Father, he gave thanks, blessing it, sanctifying it, and breaking it, he gave it to his holy Disciples and Apostles . . . " It is just this that Christ has left until His Second Coming in Glory, until the accomplishment of the Kingdom of God (St. Matt. xxvi. 29).

Eucharist means thanksgiving, means proclamation, is confession, is prayer. In the very centre of our thanking, proclaiming, confessing, praying, there is the fact of salvation *(Heilstat)* of God through Christ: " For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye shew the Lord's death till he come " (1 Cor. xi. 26). The Liturgy puts these words into the mouth of the Lord Himself: " This do in remembrance of me: for as often as ye shall eat this bread, and drink of this cup, ye do proclaim my death and confess my resurrection." In ancient formulæ of the Liturgy the congregation made the response: " We proclaim Thy death and confess Thy resurrection." And also according to our formula there is in the centre the Anamnesis, the remembrance of the Cross, of the Sepulchre, of the Resurrection on the third day, of the Ascension, of the Second Coming in Glory.

We cannot understand Christ outside the Church nor the Church without Christ her Head. But there is no other Church, but the one actualized in the eucharistic congregation, the realized Community of our Lord's Supper. Apart from the Eucharist we cannot understand Christ, His Death, His Resurrection, Ascension and Coming Again, the Kerygma of the Church, her Message, her Doctrine.

The Eucharist is the stone of offence and rock of stumbling: " Whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder " (St. Matt. xxi. 44). He who finds offence in the Eucharist can understand nothing at all, he finds the whole

life and action of the Church incomprehensible: he cannot understand her proclamation nor her confession nor her prayer. All these things are only meaningful in relation to the Eucharist.

The proclamation of the Church takes place in obedience to her Head Jesus Christ: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations" (St. Matt. xxviii. 19). This commandment was given to the Apostles, and we, the Church of to-day, *hic et nunc*, can do no more nor less than the Apostles, i.e., to fulfil this commandment. The preaching of the Church is still, to-day in the twentieth century, identical with the preaching of the Twelve Witnesses of the first century, and will remain so in future centuries until Christ's Second Coming.

This is the meaning of the word "paradosis": the Church passes along from generation to generation no more and no less than the same message which was entrusted to her in the year of the Death of Christ, of His Resurrection, His Ascension and the Descent of the Spirit. This has happened ἐφ'ἅπαξ, once for ever. And this message, the teaching of the Apostles has been laid down in the Gospels and the Apostolic Epistles, i.e., in the twenty-seven Canonical Books of the New Testament. We know that "there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world could not contain the books that should be written" (St. John xxi. 25). We know that the Apostles taught not only by letters and writings, but even more by the spoken word. We know that we cannot understand the New Testament otherwise than in the context not only of the time in which it was composed, but first of all, in the whole ἀποστολικὴ παράδοσις (Apostolic Tradition). We know also what the Apostle says in the Epistle to the Galatians (i. 8): "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed."

The Apostolic Teaching, the Church's Teaching, remains always one and the same.

The confession of the Church has found its expression in her symbolism and her dogma. The symbolism and the dogma of the Church are proclaimed to the Church by the Holy Spirit Himself, by means of the Ecumenical Councils. It is not ultimately decisive whether a majority or a minority of so-called church members accept or reject a particular council. One question is ultimately decisive: is this or that decree of a council the word of confession which the Holy Spirit gives to us to utter? The Truth is the Truth, whether it is proclaimed from a centre invested with juridical authority or not, and whether it is accepted by a majority of churchmen or not. As we only understand the Gospel in the context of the whole oral and written Kerygma, so we cannot understand otherwise the symbolism and the dogma of the Church. Particularly, in the context of the whole patristic writing, and not only of those facts which, empirically seen, led to the fixation of this or that dogma, but even of those decrees which the Church made later on, based on already fixed dogmas. An example is the decree against the Roman "*Filioque*" which was made

without convoking an ecumenical council, because dogmas were already in existence.

Is the whole history of the Church and her whole patristic literature a commentary on the dogmas of the Ecumenical Councils? If this is so, then these dogmas constitute the central path from which we must take our position in relation to this or that feature of church history or patrology.

The confession of the Church which finds its expression in its symbolism and its dogmas is the response of the creature to the Word of its Creator, and the "Yes-Word" of the Bride to her Bridegroom, neither more nor less than this: "Yea, Lord, I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" (St. Matt. xvi. 16). The Truth is given to the Church once for all, ἐφ'ἅπαξ, in the Apostolic Preaching: and also the response of the Church can always be only one and the same: the modest "Yes" of the Bride through whom the Spirit speaks: "Yea, thou art the beloved son of the Father, in whom he is well pleased" (St. Matt. iii. 17). Only the verbal form of language—and really only this—can be influenced from time to time by local and temporal circumstances. The confession of the Church of Antioch in the first century, the confession of the Church in Russia and the confession of the Church of Greece in the twentieth century, is one and the same "Yes-Word" of the Bride, even when it is uttered here in Latin or Slavonic and elsewhere in Greek.

Gospel and Dogma, the New Testament and the Decrees of the Seven Ecumenical Councils, the Kerygma, the Proclamation, and the "Homologia," the Confession, of the Church, are in their written and oral expression two matters of fact, two factors, which the Holy Spirit has placed in the midst of the Church. Christ it is, who speaks in the Church through the Spirit. Christ and the Spirit. They are the only Infallibles in the Church. We all are exposed to the possibility of error and sin. Christ it is, who puts on our unworthy lips the words of proclamation, confession and prayer. Christ it is, who leads us as members of the Church again and again into the inescapability of decision *(Ausweglosigkeit)*, into the "aporia," that we have to make our choice: either to confess or to renounce, to say "yes" or to say "no," to assume or to repudiate; to remain in Christ and by the Holy Spirit in the Church, or not. Fixedly the Lord puts the question to us: "Will ye also go away?" (St. John vi. 67).

Evermore implacably the Spirit urges the Church to the exclamation: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we believe and are sure that thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" (St. John vi. 68–69). With certainty the crisis happens, with certainty are we under judgment to be the Church or not. The message and the confession of the Church are two touchstones which the Spirit has put into the very midst of our life. But there is yet a third factor to be considered, that is the prayer of the Church, her Liturgy.

Among Orthodox churchpeople—please excuse this doubtful expression—there are to-day two different and opposed opinions which are dominant concerning the Liturgy.

The one runs as follows: Our rites are Dogma Incarnate in which

somehow the whole Truth of right belief took substance. The other makes a clear distinction between dogma and rite, between the Eternal Truth and its occasional way of becoming expressed in the Church. Dogma only is unchangeable, the rite as such can be modified or developed in each situation according to choice.

The first view has found its clearest manifestation in the identification of liturgy with dogma incarnate in the schism of the Russian Old Believers. The second view one can find in the several contemporary attempts at liturgical reform. These are fundamental questions which are of decisive importance for the future development of our practical church life. We are called therefore, not simply to repeat the phrases to which we have become accustomed, as follows: "Liturgy is incorporated dogma," or, "liturgy is the temporal-relative expression of the Eternal Absolute Truth," but we are called anew to think about what liturgy as such, properly has to be, and what it actually is. As we have already seen, the liturgy is the prayer of the Church in the Holy Spirit and through the Holy Spirit, and this prayer is in the same way proclamation and confession. In the centre of the liturgy is the Eucharist, the Thanksgiving. Before God and all the world we make known the mighty works of God, from the Creation of the World until the Second Coming we proclaim the Death of Christ and His Resurrection.

Liturgy is proclamation and confession, because it is not to be separated from Holy Scripture, the first written composition of the Apostles' Kerygma and from the confession of the Church which has found its expression in her symbolism and her dogma. Let me give only a few examples: The preaching of the Gospel had its beginning with the message "The kingdom of God is at hand," and the Eucharistic Liturgy begins with the same exclamation: "Blessed is the kingdom of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

A liturgy without Scripture-reading would be unthinkable, i.e., without reading the gospel and the epistle. A liturgy without psalmody would be likewise unthinkable. Special portions of the Gospel, e.g., the Beatitudes, are central in our praying and singing, for there is scarcely a eucharistic liturgy without the Beatitudes being sung. And not only this: let us take the silent prayers and the exclamations of the priest during the Liturgy, and consider them more precisely; we shall be surprised how many biblical words, longer quotations and single phrases from the Gospels, from the Epistles, and from the Historical, Teaching, and Prophetical Books of the Old Testament we discover there. To such an extent are our liturgical texts permeated by dogmatic motives that I do not need to dwell further on this point. I must only mention that the relation between dogma and liturgy is not restricted to the mere recitation of the Creed at Baptism and the Eucharist. Let us take only the following liturgical song, one of those which has the significant name "Dogmatikon": (Tone 8) "The King of Heaven, because of His Love towards Mankind, hath appeared upon earth and dwelt among men: for He was incarnate of a pure Virgin, and come forth from her through that Incarnation, the Only Son, twofold in Nature

but not in Person: Wherefore, proclaiming Him, in very truth, perfect God and perfect Man, we confess Christ to be our true God: Whom do thou implore, O Mother Unwedded, that He may have mercy on our souls."

To forward the understanding of the Liturgy as proclamation and confession, as an expression of the Doctrine of the Church, we must put it into the context to which it belongs by origin, that is into the context of the apostolic and dogmatic tradition of the teaching of the Church. This is important, otherwise we can become hopelessly confused and lost in the great sea of liturgics.

How often do we notice in our days that the exact biblical and dogmatic background of liturgical texts becomes forgotten, and they are handed over to spontaneous individual interpretation. Only one example for it: the Mother of God in the Liturgy is no more and no less than the Virgin Mary of Nazareth of the Gospel, and the "*Theotokos*" of the Ephesine Dogma. Only when separated from this organic unity and delivered up to the spontaneous interpretations of a brooding æstheticizing and philosophizing individual is it possible that the Church's devotion to Mary should be made something like Goethe's cult of the "Eternal Feminine."

Yet another note, lest we lose ourselves in this shoreless sea of spontaneous and even dreadful misinterpretations of liturgical texts: We must distinguish between liturgical texts in which we have to do with poetical, figurative language, and those in a strict dogmatic language. Obviously here is not the place to enter into the problems of sophiology which move Russian religious thought nowadays. Without allowing myself to judge this problem as such, I want only to note that dogmas and historical facts which have been supposed to be connected with sophiology have only very little relevance to it. This could be proved by means of the more profound critique indicated above.

Another example: In church prayers the following words are found addressed to the Mother of God: "Thou good earth." At first sight it should be clear that this is only a metaphor. Moreover, this image is derived from St. Irenæus of Lyons (the soil, from which Adam was made was virgin). Unfortunately on the basis of this passage attempts have been made mystically to identify the Mother of God with the Earth. It is strange that only the image of the earth, and not any of the other numerous possibilities, is treated in this way. These are likewise used as symbols for the Mother of God: "Golden Censer" and "Closed Door."

But coming back to the point at issue: The Liturgy is the word of confession and prayer which the Spirit speaks by the Church, a fact which the Spirit has put in the midst of the life of the Church. From the above statements one could conclude that liturgy is dogma incorporate and is the crystallized deposit of absolute Truth. But this last conclusion would be premature.

The Canon of the New Testament is already fixed; the Creed and the dogmas of the Church once for ever defined. This does not mean that new ecumenical councils would not be possible occasionally. But that which is once dogmatically fixed is established once for ever. But such an

established shape does not exist for the Liturgy. There is no ideal Mass formula. There is an abundance of possible forms: but there is not any shape in the Church which could claim to be in all its details once for ever the shape of the Liturgy.

In a certain sense there has been and there will be such a shape. It was in existence the night the Lord was betrayed, and will be in existence on the Day of the Lord's Second Coming, when He will drink with us from the vine anew in the Kingdom of His Father. In the meantime we are in the era of the Church, the time of innumerable concrete eucharistic gatherings of the Church. Each of these gatherings is according to its substance identical with the First Eucharistic Meal, the Night of the Betrayal. The bread and the wine are taken, thanks is given over them, the bread is broken, the bread is given to eat and the wine to drink.

In each eucharistic gathering the Death of Christ is proclaimed and His Resurrection is confessed. Each eucharistic gathering is directed towards the Day of the Second Advent of the Lord. Each eucharistic gathering is the proclamation, confession and prayer of the Church, is the Word of the Spirit through the Church. But at the same time the Eucharist, here and now, is happening in the concrete congregation. There does not plainly exist any abstract liturgical shape, there is no church outside the eucharistic community gathered here and now. Always round the Lord there are gathered individual men with their concrete needs and petitions. Therefore liturgical life in its ritual, but not in its dogmatic aspect, is subject to particular and temporal local conditional variations.

" Of Thy mystic Feast to-day, O Son of God, receive me as a partaker." This is what we must consider: The Supper of Jesus Christ in relation to us to-day. The substance of the Liturgy has been completely misunderstood by any one who wants to canonize once for all the Mass formula with all its details.

For example: (a) The custom, inconceivable but common in the real Church to-day, of conducting (as a result of some historical events) morning prayers in the evening. (b) Catechumens who do not exist are turned out of the Church.

The Liturgy is the Word of the Holy Spirit through us; but this Word is always the same. It is happening, however, *in actu hic et nunc*. Because of this fact and because the participants in the Liturgy are real men, even certain liturgical errors are not excluded. According to a saying of St. Cyprian of Carthage, there are possible customs which have no truth, for they are not more than an ancient error and must be removed. Situations of a " dreadful liturgical dualism " are possible: The Lord present in the Bread and in the Wine—sinners before Him who eat and drink His true Body and His true Blood to their own condemnation. Here the word of prayer of the Holy Spirit is found on lips of unworthy men and in the same way on the same lips words of vanity, of little faith, or even of blasphemy.

The Liturgy is always happening *hic et nunc in actu*. Again there is no room for liturgical free will of any kind. The liturgical forms in our

Church of to-day are in a certain sense simply indispensable for us, like the New Testament and the Creed of the Church. Even if it were theoretically possible to substitute this or that other religious shape, yet this does not mean that this must be practically realized.

There exists a wrong attitude to the external liturgical shape, finding its expression in this way: that the once given traditional shape, even if it has already lost its significance to-day, is considered as an untouchable sanctuary. An example is the *ektenie* of the catechumens, or far worse, the morning prayers in the evening, which never had any reasonable sense.

But there exists also an overemphasis on the outer shape, which finds its expression in just the opposite way. This is seen when men attempt to evade religious facts, as they confront us to-day, in order to restore some forms of the past. An example is seen in the experiment of creating several Orthodox national rites in the twentieth century.

We have always to start from the point that the Liturgy is an indispensable fact, as we see it in the Church of to-day, and that the author of this fact is the Holy Spirit Himself above all others, and He takes the first place. We know that the Word which the Holy Spirit utters in the Liturgy has not yet found its last crystalline expression, and also that this will not be found until Christ's coming again.

Nevertheless, we hear in and by the Liturgy the unutterable groanings of the Spirit, in which we members of the Church are called to be partakers. The Liturgy in its real present shape is therefore chiefly a fact, before which we can only stay in deepest humility and veneration. Our task is not restoration and reformation only for the sake of secondary reasons concerning the question of liturgical renovation. Only particular liturgical questions may be discussed in our times.

If the Liturgy is the Word of the Spirit through the Church *hic et nunc*, then it depends upon all that is said and done, that has real meaning here and now. And all that which only has historical importance must subside and recede. But at the same time we must be critical of ourselves. I believe, in the Orthodox Church of to-day, there is something needing to be reformed in the liturgical life. But, I think, these are small matters, and often not what one usually supposes. Also here we have not to forget the old sentence: "*Homines per sacra reformandi sunt, non sacra per homines.*"

And yet another point: As we have seen, the New Testament cannot be understood without its context of the "paradosis," nor the dogmas without their context of church history and patristics. Also we cannot understand the liturgical texts without the context of ascetical literature. There is no spiritual, ascetical life without the Liturgy; and no liturgical life whose fruit would not be ascetical and spiritual life. With regard to the question of how the service has to be conducted, we are advised not only by the liturgical books, but also by the ascetical literature of the Church. We are not able to separate the Liturgy from life, nor life from the Liturgy. Even the hermit, practising the Jesus prayer perhaps, is only a special case in the liturgical life of the Church.

With reference to the above I will add briefly: a revision of liturgical forms has to grow from the very centre of the life of the Church to-day which is given to her by the Holy Spirit and preserved by Him through all generations. So we must listen to the Voice of the Spirit, testified by the means described above and corresponding with the Church as it exists to-day. This is so essential that we have no right to mingle our own doubtful human desires and ambitions with the Voice of the Holy Spirit who alone gives witness by His Church to the Risen Christ in whom alone His Church confesses to Mankind, to us, our hope of eternal salvation.

MARTIN JORDAN.

THE EUCHARIST AND THE ANGLICAN CHRYSOSTOM

by H. BOONE PORTER, JR.

Reprinted with permission from "The Holy Cross Magazine," West Park, N.Y., U.S.A.

"THE parallel . . . has more than once been observed between St. Chrysostom and our own Bishop Taylor: and it is good for the Church in general, and encouraging for our own Church in particular, to notice such providential revivals of ancient graces in modern times. . . ."

So wrote the holy priest who started the Oxford Movement, Father John Keble, and the "providential revival" of grace which he urges us to notice continues to have both interest and importance. The seventeenth century Divines, of whom Bishop Jeremy Taylor was one of the greatest, bound Anglicanism for ever to those principles which continue both to guide and to characterize our Church. To them we owe the Anglican insistence on incarnational theology, the apostolic ministry and sacramental grace, as is well known.

What is less well known, however, is the way in which the great Divines revived the sacramental theology of the ancient Fathers, and incorporated this tradition into the thought and life of our Church. It was a rather extraordinary achievement to take the teaching of the Greek Fathers, formulated a dozen centuries before, at the Eastern end of the Mediterranean, and to actually bring it to life as a constructive and creative force in English spirituality.

Believing with Keble, that this is both good and encouraging to notice, I should like to present at least a taste of this brilliant and remarkable theology. St. John Chrysostom is as typical of classical Greek theology as is Blessed Jeremy Taylor of classical Anglican theology, and their teaching on the Holy Eucharist is an excellent example of their thought.

There is no more beautiful sentence on the Liturgy in the whole English language, than what Taylor says in *Holy Living:*

"When the holy man stands at the Table of Blessing, and ministers the rite of consecration, then do as the Angels do, who behold, and love, and wonder, that the Son of God should become food to the souls of His servants; that He who cannot suffer any change or lessening should be broken into pieces and enter into the body to support and nourish the

spirit, and yet at the same time remain in Heaven while He descends to thee upon Earth; that He who hath essential felicity should become miserable and die for thee and then give Himself to thee for ever to redeem thee from sin and misery; that by His wounds He should procure health for thee, by His affronts He should entitle thee to glory, by His death He should bring thee to life, and by becoming a Man He should make thee partaker of the Divine Nature." Chapt. IV, sect. X

No comment can add to the beauty of this passage, but it is well worth noting how permeated it is with the thought of the Greek Fathers. Even for the word *priest*, Taylor directly translates *holy man* from the Greek term. Typical of the Fathers is the easy and unselfconscious mixture of dogmatic theology, references to the events of the Incarnation, and practical pious exhortation. It closes with the great note of St. Athanasius: God became Man to make man divine. I should especially like to point out allusions to the heavenly character of the Liturgy. We worship with the Angels.

This is a leading idea which Taylor elsewhere develops at length. But we may consider a brief passage from *The Worthy Communicant*. This latter is reminiscent of the previous quotation, but derives so much from a passage in Chrysostom that the two can be considered in parallel.

Taylor

"When the holy man reaches forth his hands upon the Symbols and prays over them and intercedes for the sins of the people, and breaks the Holy Bread and pours forth the Sacred Chalice, place thyself by faith and meditation in Heaven, and see Christ doing in His glorious manner this very thing which thou seest ministered and imitated upon the Table of the Lord."

The Worthy Communicant, chapt. VII, sect. I.

Chrysostom

"When thou seest the Lord sacrificed and laid upon the Altar, and the priest standing and praying over the Victim, and all the worshippers empurpled with that precious Blood, canst thou then think that thou art still among men and standing upon Earth? Art thou not, on the contrary, straightway translated to Heaven? . . . And this all do through the eyes of faith."

On The Priesthood, Book III, sect. IV.

Bishop Taylor is directly inspired by St. Chrysostom's magnificent outburst, but consider how skilfully he paraphrases. Chrysostom is exalted and poetic, but not so specific. Taylor wants his reader to understand that he is not discussing any vague, general spiritual realities, but that he is referring directly to the things one sees in one's church on Sunday morning. The Liturgy is not heavenly because it is beautiful and remarkable, but because it really does present to God, here and now, the same Sacrifice our Saviour is pleading for us in Heaven. "Both Christ in Heaven and His ministers on earth actuate that Sacrifice." (*The Office Ministerial*, sect. V.) Beneath Taylor's stately prose is the firm doctrinal consistency of a man who endured years of Cromwellian persecution for refusing to relinquish or renounce the Catholic priesthood.

Secondly, we may consider another great note in classical Anglicanism, which as it appears in Bishop Taylor, was likewise largely derived from St. Chrysostom. This is the conception of the unity—yes, even the *identity*—of Christ's Sacramental Body and His Mystical Body. Both comment on 1st Corinthians, X, 17:

Taylor

"Christ is our Head, and we the members of His Body, and are united in this mystical union by the Holy Sacrament; not only because it does symbolically teach . . . but even by the blessing of God and the operation of the Holy Spirit in the Sacrament. . . . And therefore it was not without mystery that the congregation of all Christ's servants, His Church, and this sacramental Bread, are both in Scripture called by the same name: this Bread is the Body of Christ, and the Church is Christ's Body too; for by the communion of this Bread all faithful people are confederated into one Body, the Body of our Lord."

The Worthy Communicant, chapt. I, sect. IV.

Chrysostom

"We are that self-same Body. For what is the Bread? The Body of Christ. And what do they become who partake of it? The Body of Christ. Not many bodies, but one Body."

Commentary on 1st Cor., chapt. X.

"The Scripture is wont to give the name of 'Flesh' to the mysteries of the Eucharist and to the whole Church, calling them the Body of Christ."

Commentary on Gal., chapt. V.

Thirdly, both bear witness to the Church's constant affirmation of the moral and social obligations imposed by the Christian sacramental life.

Taylor

"Fail not at this solemnity, according to the custom of pious and devout people, to make an offering to God for the uses of religion and the poor, according to thy ability. For when Christ feasts His Body, let us also feast our fellow members, who have a right to the same promises and are partakers of the same Sacrament."

Holy Living, chapt. IV, sect. X.

Chrysostom

"Art thou making a remembrance of Christ and despisest thou the poor? . . . How can it be other than unworthily when one neglects the hungry? . . . Let us nourish Christ; let us give Him drink; let us clothe Him: these things are worthy of that Table."

Commentary on 1st Cor., chapt. XI.

These few samples are enough to show how vivid and stimulating the Greek Fathers can be, and also how effectively and constructively the Anglican Divines applied their teaching. There is much that is modern in the early Fathers, and the continental reformers often quoted them. But the great Anglican Divines showed that a truly patristic theology can only exist within the living framework of liturgical and sacramental tradition.

The glory of patristic theology is its synthesis of reasoned doctrine, Holy Scripture, sacramental life, and practical piety. It is the achievement of the great Divines that they transplanted and transposed this synthesis into Anglicanism, so as to embrace the Western theological tradition, the King James Bible, the Prayer Book, and a modern practice of piety. Such a book as *Holy Living* deserves a permanent place in Anglo-Catholic devotional life, not merely because it is intrinsically better than most modern manuals, or even because it was written by a confessor's hand, but because it, and some other books, like it, played a role of permanent historical importance in the formulation of the traditions of our Church. They took the principles and ideals of Anglican theology, and shaped them into a living practice of spirituality and devotion. Through English Catholicism, thus reformed, martyrs and confessors, hosts of ordinary people, and countless sinners, have been "confederated into one Body, the Body of our Lord."

THE THEOPHANY RITES IN THE WEST

THERE is no more striking difference between the piety of East and West than in regard to the Feast of Theophany. In the East, the commemoration of Christ's Baptism and the hallowing and distribution of water is one of the best loved rites of the whole year. In the West, on the other hand, Epiphany is above all the feast of the Magi presenting their gifts at Bethlehem.

If we look beneath the surface, we will indeed find many allusions to Christ's Baptism in the Western rites. Westerners themselves, however, will be very much surprised to learn that even the hallowing and distribution of the water has had a place in the Western tradition.

Let it be understood at the outset that the hallowing of the water is a *baptismal* rite. Throughout the ancient Church, Baptism was administered mainly on Easter Eve, but from early times the East also had a second occasion for administering it—the feast of the Saviour's own Baptism.

This Eastern custom was followed in some parts of Gaul. Just as Easter Baptism had its season of preparation, Lent, so the Epiphany Baptism developed a preceding period of penitence and training in Gaul. With the universal adoption of December 25th as the Feast of the Nativity, the old season of pre-baptismal training became altered into a period of preparation for Christmas—the period now known as Advent. Orthodox who have visited Anglican churches during the month before Christmas will recall the many allusions to St. John the Baptist which occur during the Advent services.

In the early Middle Ages, both in the East and in parts of what is now France, Epiphany remained a time for the solemn administration of Baptism. In both the East and Gaul, the hallowed waters of the baptismal font were distributed to the people to take home.

Surprisingly enough, the custom was still flourishing in some parts of Gaul in the time of Charlemagne, much to his distress. He was eager to impose the strict observance of the Roman rite, which at that time only

permitted public Baptism at Easter and Pentecost Eves. Yet in some quarters the Epiphany Baptism was so cherished that it was locally incorporated into the Roman rite. An order was composed for performing the ceremonies according to the "Roman" usage!

Ordo Romanus XV (Andrieu's numbering) provides as follows for the opening of the feast: "When, therefore, the Nocturns and Matins have been performed, they next go to the fonts, with candles and thuribles, singing the *Te Deum* (the hymn of St. Ambrose). This finished, they begin the litany, that is, 'O Christ, hear us,' and the rest. When that litany is done, immediately the bishop blesses the fonts. After the blessing, he puts chrism into the fonts making a cross, and with his hand he sprinkles some of the same chrism into all the fonts (another text has it: he sprinkles all the people). This done, all the people take a blessing of this water, each one in their own vessels, for sprinkling not only in their homes, but also in their vineyard, fields and fruits. Then the presbyters and deacons take off their shoes, . . . step into the fonts, . . . and baptize the children . . ." (*Ordines Romani*, Michel Andrieu edit., v. III, pp. 110–12.)

This document was composed in Gaul in the third quarter of the eighth century. Its description of the baptismal rites is but a series of quotations from the directions for the old Roman baptismal rites in Ordo Romanus XI (Andrieu's *Ordines*, v. II, pp. 444–5). The distribution of Baptismal waters, which in the East was done at the Theophany, seems to have traditionally been done at Rome on Easter Eve.

During the Middle Ages, the solemn ancient rites of public Baptism at the liturgical times were generally given up throughout Christendom, and children were baptized individually whenever convenient. In the East, this left the hallowing of the waters at Theophany to stand alone as a special rite, separate from Baptism. Likewise in the Latin rite, the font is hallowed on Easter Eve even if no Baptisms occur. It will also be noted how closely the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel in the Prayer Book relate to Baptism on this day. It is a cause for rejoicing that nowadays a number of children are baptized on Easter Eve in some Anglican parishes.

But when was the hallowing of water at Epiphany abolished in the West? There is reason to believe that traces of it never entirely vanished from the Latin rite. The Roman Rituale still contains an order for "Blessing Homes on Holy Saturday." What is this? The priest is directed to take blessed water from the baptismal font and to sprinkle it in the house to be blessed. Is there anything analogous on Epiphany? Yes, there is also an order for "Blessing homes on Epiphany." The *Magnificat* is sung, prayers are said, and the house is blessed with incense and holy water. (Ordinary holy water is not taken from the font, but is blessed with prayers not entirely unrelated to the baptismal rite.) In some places this ceremony is perhaps still performed.

In the West to-day, Epiphany forms the conclusion of the Christmas Feast, much as Pentecost concludes the Easter Feast. References to Christ's Baptism and likewise to the Miracle of Cana, have not, however, been abandoned. In the Church of England, the Gospel at the Eucharist on the

Epiphany refers to the Magi, but at Matins Christ's Baptism is commemorated; at Evensong it is the Miracle of Cana. On the Sunday following, the Gospel at the Eucharist is closely related—the finding of the Boy Jesus in the Temple. The next Sunday, the Miracle of Cana is thus commemorated again. There are similar arrangements in other parts of the Anglican world. The American Prayer Book gives a chronological order to this whole series of Eucharistic Gospels. Epiphany Day, it is the Magi; the first Sunday after, Christ in the Temple; the second Sunday, Christ's Baptism; and the third Sunday, the Wedding at Cana.

In conclusion, the question may be raised whether any Western Christians may ever again adopt the hallowing and distribution of water at Epiphany. The answer is, I think, clear. This ceremony will only win its way into new lands if it is presented in its true and ancient context: the solemn administration of Holy Baptism. If the normal administration of this Sacrament once again becomes confined to special liturgical seasons—and some Anglicans hope it will—it will doubtless inspire appropriate expressions of piety; more than this cannot be said. All Christians, however, must shoulder the responsibility of proclaiming anew to the modern world the full meaning of Christian Baptism. It may well be that a new emphasis on the Theophany will be part of this task.

H. Boone Porter.

THE OFFICE OF PREPARATION AND THANKSGIVING FOR HOLY COMMUNION ACCORDING TO THE ORTHODOX RITE [1]

THE composition of an office of preparation for the Holy Communion and thanksgiving for reception would appear to be comparatively modern. In the early days of the life of the Church, any set prayers, let alone a formal arrangement of such, would be out of the question; indeed we know little of a felt need for such, while the fervour of new converts acted as a leaven of the whole Christian life. In all probability, in the East at any rate, the source of a set preparation, as so much else in the liturgical and ascetical life, was monastic. The Religious would prepare with great care and over a considerable period, for the increasingly rare occasions in the year when Communion was made. This becomes clear when the Office of Reception (*Metalêpsis*) of Communion is looked into more carefully. First of all, the development of thought and belief about the Eucharist, reaching a height in the fifth and sixth centuries, but going back much earlier, stresses the awe and mystery that surrounded the celebration of the Divine Liturgy and the reception of the Holy Gifts. This is particularly prominent in the Byzantine religious world. Earlier, for instance in the West, in the fourth century, the teaching of St. Ambrose of Milan, no doubt traditional since he entered ecclesiastical life comparatively late in life, suggests another line of thought. This is the bridal theme, a more radiant and

[1] Service of Preparation for Holy Communion. Greek text with a rendering in English. Printed for private circulation, London 1931, 6d. (obtainable at the Faith Press and the Greek Cathedral of the Holy Wisdom, Bayswater, W. 2).

altogether more confident context, in which the Christian finds in Communion with our Lord, the Bridegroom of the Heavenly Supper and Feast, the fulfilment of joyous spiritual union. This fertile range of ideas does not appear to have established itself even in the West. Counter-Reformation Offices of Preparation and Thanksgiving, when so much of this work as used to-day was prepared, know little of it.

The Office of Preparation, to be found in the usual books of Orthodox devotion, the "Great Orologion" or "Book of Hours," the Holy Synopsis or "Compendium," and attached to copies of the Divine Liturgy intended to be used by the clergy in church, presents a form generally already familiar to Anglican church people. In substance it consists of a preparatory office to be used the night before of a short "Canon"—troparia and Theotokia, arranged acrostically for each letter of the alphabet. On the day itself the office consists of three psalms (23, 24, 116 v. 10ff. in the English Prayer Book Psalter enumeration) and ten prayers of supplication, leading up to the devout ejaculations immediately before the act of Holy Communion.

These ten prayers are of great beauty and variety of expression. Those that bear the names of St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom and St. John Damascene, are addressed to our Lord and are conspicuous for their sense of unworthiness in approaching the divine and terrible Mysteries of His Body and Blood; a continual calling on His Mercy and a mentioning of the many examples of sinners approaching our Lord, the cleansing Fountain of Life and Immortality in the Gospel and the need for the prayers of the Saints. They are prefaced by a significant "Didactic-Rhyme" which strikes another characteristic note in the approach to Communion:

"Thou, O man, about to receive as food the Body of the Master,
In fear approach, lest thou be scorched; for It is fire.
And, drinking the Holy Blood unto Communion,
First be at peace with those who afflict thee,
Then with courage receive the mystic Food."

Here is expressed a pregnant truth that finds its completion in the great poem of St. Simeon the New Theologian, in the seventh Prayer. The source of the metaphor is in all probability the great vision of Isaiah and the live coal from off the cleansing heavenly altar placed on his lips by the seraph. But along with that is the manifestation to Moses of the Uncreated Light in the Burning Bush that was unconsumed. The miracle that turns the consuming flame into the dew of Grace is peculiar to the Hesychiast tradition that culminated in the teaching of St. Gregory Palamas:

"At once I fear and I rejoice,
And I who am but straw
Receive the *Fire*:
And—strange Miracle—
As with dew I am besprinkled
Even as the Bush of old,
which unconsumed did burn."

Yet another great theme of this office of preparation is the emphasis upon

deification of the redeemed Christian, body and soul by participation in the divine Mysteries. Christian grace does not merely deliver man from sin: it is the working out of the process of sanctification by the indwelling Holy Spirit, which is to have its end in participation in the divine nature. *Thêosis*, or the divinization of the complete human being, body and soul, has always been a triumphant note of patristic and Orthodox teaching. The Reception of the Holy Communion is an essential element in the realization of the gift of immortal life. Finally, there is the fitting and congruent place of the Mother of God, the Saints and the "Bodiless Ones" (the Holy Angels) in the service of the Divine Mysteries and in their powerful advocacy and presentation of the prayers of Christians, still in this life, before the throne of Grace. St. Simeon the Translator expresses this with beauty and power in his prayer of thanksgiving after Reception:

"As suppliants I bring to Thee all those whom Thou hast made holy:
The leaders of the angelic Powers:
Thy Fore-runner, Thine enlightened Apostles,
And further, Thy pure and spotless Mother.
The prayers of these receive, O merciful Christ,
And make Thy servant a child of light."

The small booklet issued privately and referred to at the beginning of this article is a simplification of the entire Office as found in the official books. As the reception of Holy Communion increases in frequency among the Orthodox, some abbreviation of a long office is doubtless necessary.

A.O.

A HESYCHAST IN THE MAKING

I HAVE been urged to publish more of the Answers of Varsanuphius and John—the key figures in that *milieu* from which I published "An Idyll of the Monks of Gaza" in our last issue. And it seemed best to publish the first set of letters—those to John of Beersheba—together with the Preface set before the whole collection by the original editor, a nameless monk of the Cenobium, who had himself seen Varsanuphius on the one occasion when the latter, to assuage the doubts of a brother who suspected that the unseen "Great Old Man" was a figment of the Abbot, came out of his cell and washed the feet of the brethren. This editor did his work well, giving us the letters as he found them, with the minimum of introductory explanation to each letter. The tantalizing gaps in the story presented to us, and the frequent repetitions, are inevitable in this type of literature, and assure us of its genuineness. There is sufficient continuity in the series before us to give us the thread of the story of a soul's progress, although we have no clear indication of the lapse of time.

The correspondence with John of Beersheba* appears to be the earliest in the collection—for the first letter shows us Abbot Seridus being told how he is to do the work of "secretary" to the Great Old Man. Its beginning may be dated somewhere around A.D. 525. It begins with John still a

* The 3rd Letter shows that he is *not* to be identified with John, the "Other Old Man," the writer of this letter, who, though taking no further part in this particular correspondence, is responsible for something like half of the whole collection.

prominent member, if not Abbot, of a community at Beersheba, aspiring to the hesychastic life at the Gaza Cenobium. Apparently between Letters VI and VII he comes to the Cenobium, and immediately finds himself in a position of some responsibility there. The second instalment will show him permitted at last to fulfil his desire of enclosure in a recluse's cell, and something of his temptations and stumblings in that life. The series breaks off as it were fortuitously, leaving us with the picture of one who is set on the road, but has still a long journey ahead of him.

We can hardly hope to publish the complete works of Varsanuphius and John (about 850 letters) in the *Christian East*—with an instalment similar to this in every issue, it would take about nine years! But the fifty-four letters which make up this first set give a fair sample of the whole work, containing much which is found again and again elsewhere in the collection —the refusal to impose a definite "Rule of Life": the identification of the entry on the recluse life with the "Mounting of the Cross": the call to become "Brothers of Christ": the rousing of the Jesus asleep within us. Occasionally we have glimpses of liturgical order, as when Letter XXIV gives us the Scripture Readings for two successive days. Frequently we see something of the conditions of life in the Cenobium and the world around —the sun-dried bricks used for the monastic buildings in the Gaza plain: the journey to Egypt by sea in search of ἐργόχειρον. Not a few words unknown elsewhere are added to our Greek vocabulary—e.g. the unexplained "λευκάδοις" of Letter XXII.

I have adopted the use of italics for the questions and editorial pieces; for Scriptural quotations (which are not always exact); for unexplained words like "*leucada*," and for certain words which I have adapted from the Greek in despair of a true translation (e.g. *noetic* and *œconomically*), or which I have used in their original sense as truly representing the Greek, although their common use has changed for the worse (e.g. *condescension*).

D.J.C.

Letters and Answers of two Spiritual Old Men living in a Cenobium in the country round Gaza, called that of the Abba Seridus, sent by way of the hegoumen, to wit the same Abba Seridus, who also ministered to them: and their names were Varsanuphius and John.

PROLOGUE

We beg those who read this book to accept with gratitude, reverence and faith, the things written therein, and rather to study to come by grace of Christ to imitation of the life and good actions of those who spake them. For having trained their own life long time according to God by endurance and faith, and, as the Apostle says, striven *lawfully*, and in all things followed in the way of the holy fathers, they became worthy of so great grace-gifts from God. But when we are intending to read the things written in this book, we ought to know that some of them were spoken to anchorites, and some to those in cenobia, and others to those in choir, and others again to priests and Christ-loving laity: and some to younger men or novices, some to men already advanced in age and exercised in the habit, and

others to men approaching the perfection, of virtue, as each was suited to hear. For the same teachings are not suited to all. For as in the ages of the body there are different foods for the sucking child, for the adolescent, and for those advanced in age, so also in regard to the ages of the spirit. Often also they answered having regard to the infirmity of the thought of the questioner, coming down *œconomically* to his level, so that he should not fall into despair—as also we find in the *Lives of the Old Men*. And we must not receive as a general rule the things thus said by way of *condescension* to particular people, having regard to their infirmity, but at once distinguish that certainly the answer given by the saints was adjusted to the questioner. For it happens also that such a one, being roused to wakefulness one day by the prayers of the saints, should come to a condition that befits monks, and should then hear again the things which behove him.

And I beg you in the Lord to remember also in your holy prayers my lowliness who by God's help have delivered here to writing these answers, for the profit of those who read them in the fear of God: that the words of the saints may not be to me for judgment, but I may be protected by their prayers and yours, now and unto the day of judgment: Amen.

I. Answer of the Great Old Man to the Abba John from Beersheba, when he had asked to come and live with them in the Cenobium.

It is written in the Apostle, "*That He which hath begun a good work in you will Himself also complete it until the day of our Lord Jesus Christ.*"[1] And again our Master said to him who came to Him, "*If any man renounces not all that he hath, and his family, yea and hates not his own soul also, he cannot be my disciple.*"[2] But it is possible for God to fulfil upon us the saying, "*Behold now what is good and what is pleasant, but that brethren should dwell together.*"[3] But I pray that thou mayest attain the measure written of in the Acts, that "*As many as had properties sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them down at the Apostles' feet.*"[4] And I, knowing that thy purpose was according to God, said to our beloved son Seridus, who after God protects us from men—and we hope unto God that he will also protect thee with us—"Receive brother John with much love, and do not hesitate at all: for two years ago God revealed to me that he will be coming here, and that many of the brethren are going to be gathered to us: and I kept this revelation until I should learn what the Lord is doing: now then that the time is fulfilled, I have also declared it to you." And since thou hast reckoned that I should provide thee something from what I wear—lo, in the presence of the brother I have taken off the cowl from my head, and sent it to thee by him, saying, "Give it him, and bring me another instead

[1] Phil. i. 6.
[2] Luke xiv. 33 and 26.
[3] Ps. cxxxiii. (cxxxii.) 1.
[4] Acts iv. 34.

of it." Keep this then until thine end. For it is going to protect thee from many ills and trials. Do not give it then to any. For it is a blessing of God from my hands. And study to complete thy work, and to acquit thyself of every commitment as we acquitted ourselves: and settle with us, with freedom from care, giving thy time to God.

And I, Seridus, tell thee a wonderful thing. For as the Old Man said this, I considered in myself, "How can I hold these things to write them? If the Old Man had wanted, I could have brought here the ink and the paper, and heard word by word and written it down." But he knew what I was thinking, and his face shone like fire, and he said to me, "Go, write, be not afraid, until I tell thee ten thousand words, to write, neither too much nor too little, to the very letter; the Spirit of God lets thee write it: and not if thou wilt, but He guides thy hand how thou shalt write them with coherence.

II. Answer of the same Great Old Man to the same, indicating to him the divers afflictions that should come upon him, and the bodily infirmity, and what progress of soul should come from these, and what blessedness thence:—

Say to brother John, *Stablish thy heart firm as a hard rock*[5]—I mean the *noetic* rock—to be able to hear what I am about to say. Give heed then to thyself, lest hearing this thou be uplifted in thy heart, and fall away from the spiritual promise. For swelling pride has ruined many even of those who had attained the measure. But prepare thyself for thanksgiving in all things, having heard the holy Apostle saying, "*In all things give thanks.*"[6] Whether then *in afflictions* or *in necessities* or *distresses*, or in *infirmities* and bodily *labours*,[7] in all the things that come upon thee give thanks unto God. For I hope that thou too art to come into His rest. For *we must through many afflictions enter into the Kingdom of God.*[8] Doubt not then in thy soul, and let not thy heart faint in anything, but remember the Apostolic saying, "*Though our outward man perish, yet our inward man is renewed from day to day.*"[9] If then thou endurest not the sufferings, thou canst not come unto the Cross. But if thou bearest in the first place the sufferings, thou enterest into the haven of His rest, and livest in quiet henceforth in much freedom from care, having thy soul firmly stablished and cleaving to the Lord through everything, guarded in faith, rejoicing in hope, made glad in love, preserved in the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity. And then the saying is concerning thee, "*Let the heavens be glad and let the earth rejoice.*"[10] For this is the care-free life of the man of God. For the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost rejoice at the salvation of thy soul, my beloved brother.

[5] 1 Sam. ii. 1 (Is. l. 7).
[6] 1 Thess. v. 18.
[7] 2 Cor. vi. 4; xii. 10.
[8] Acts xiv. 22.
[9] 2 Cor. iv. 16.
[10] Ps. xcvi. (xcv.) 11.

A F E T Y A F I L M

III. Answer of the Other Old Man to the same when he had asked that he might meet him:—

Tell the brother—Forgive me for the Lord's sake, that I desire to see thee, but for the sake of the others' conscience I do not find freedom. But I congratulate thy love at the promises sent thee from the holy Old Man. And blessed art thou to have been counted worthy of these.

IV. When a trial had been stirred up for the monks of the place where the Abba John was living before he came to the Cenobium, and trouble was going to be stirred up there when he was there, the Great Old Man foreseeing this in spirit, wrote to him thus:—

Write to brother John—Behold I send thee three testimonies from the power of God and from the Scriptures of the Holy Ghost, in which I awaken thy mind to vigilance of God, and to understandings of the Holy Ghost, that thou mayest know concerning the present time, what it is. The first testimony is this: God said by the Prophet Isaiah: "*Come, my people, enter thou into thy chambers and shut thy doors a little, until the Wrath of the Lord be overpast.*"[11] The second testimony is this: "*Come out from among them and be ye separate, and touch no unclean thing, saith the Lord, and I will receive you and will be a father ~~unto~~ you, and ye shall be to me sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty.*"[12] The third testimony: "*Look how ye walk, not as ~~unwise~~ but as wise, redeeming the time, because the days are evil.*"[13] But I say to thee, run to the things set before thee, and complete thy work swiftly, remembering thy Lord who says, "*No man having put his hand to the plough and turning back is fitted for the Kingdom of heaven*"[14]; and the "*Let the dead bury their dead, and come thou and preach the kingdom of Heaven.*"[15] For I look to thy quiet life which awaits thee in Christ Jesus our Lord.

V. Answer of the same Great Old Man to the Abbot when he was grieved that the Abba John was so long in coming, and thought as a result that he was not coming:—

Be not disheartened, my child, nor grieved about our brother. For even if he is absent in body, yet he is present in spirit and is with us continually. For he is our twin soul, and no man separates him from our love from now and unto the end of the world.

VI. Letter of the same Great Old Man written to the same Abba John when he was carrying out in his own country certain requirements for the Cenobium, and was troubled by bodily warfare:—

Write to the brother—While thou art outside, performing thy labour according to thy power for God and for the souls of the brethren, or rather

[11] Is. xxvi. 20.
[12] 2 Cor. vi. 17–18.
[13] Eph. v. 15–16.
[14] Luke ix. 62.
[15] Ibid., 60.

for our own refreshment and quiet and for thine—for if the brethren are refreshed and protected by means of us, we also by means of them find the perfect quiet, and there is fulfilled upon us the word that is written, "*A brother aided by a brother is like a strong and fenced city*"[16]—cut short all relationships and occasions that thou hast whilst thou art yet without, and allow no occasion, nor relationship with any, dragging thee backwards. For if thou art not thus, thou settlest not in perfect quiet. For so we also did. If therefore thou dost this, I hope that thou wilt settle in perfect quiet. For indeed, with God's help, thy lot falls with us, and thy portion with us unto the end of the world. Let none learn at present what we are writing to thee. Perform then thy labour, and if the matter prosper before thee, give thanks to God, and pray to Him. For this is the "*In everything give thanks.*" And let us not neglect to pay our thanksgiving to God, like him about whom thou once toldest the parable, that he used to go to pray in the Church that food might be managed for him, and somebody met him once saying, "Breakfast with me to-day, and then go and pray," and he said, "I am not going: for that is what I was going to ask from God." But as for us, whether we find or no, let us pay our thanksgiving to God. But see to it that thou carry *the dying of Jesus in thy body*[17] through everything.

VII. Answer of the same Great Old Man to the same when he was about to go with the brethren to collect material for handiwork, and was afraid of the desert character of the country. And a reminder to be watchful against the bodily warfare that troubled him: and a promise of God's assistance towards the withdrawal to them that he was working for:—

Say to him who has been called by the divine purpose from on high, to dwell with us not only in this world but also in the world to come, our true brother and twin soul John—Our Master Christ said to His disciples, "*Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? And one of them shall not fall to the ground without my Father who is in Heaven. But the very hairs of your head are numbered. Fear not therefore. Ye are of more value than many sparrows. Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven.*"[18] Take heed therefore unto thyself with vigilance, to set God before thee continually, that concerning thee also the prophetic word may be fulfilled, "I foresaw the Lord before my face continually: for He is on my right hand, that I may not be moved."[19] Stretch out therefore thy hands from thy whole soul to the things which are set before thee, and meditate upon these continually, so that thou mayest hear the voice of God saying to thee, "*Behold I will send my angel before thy face, who will prepare thy way before thee.*"[20]

[16] Prov. xviii. 19.
[17] 2 Cor. iv. 10.
[18] Matt. x. 29–32.
[19] Ps. xvi. (xv.) 8.
[20] Matt. xi. 10.

VIII. The same, having wearied himself considerably, and found no handiwork, was grieved, and surprised how the angel had not been sent for succour according to the word of the Old Man. For he did not understand that this had been said to him with a view to the quittance of his withdrawal. And for this cause the Old Man wrote thus to him:—

Write to the brother—As long as the ship is at sea, it expects dangers and the onset of winds. But if it reach the haven of quiet and of peace, it has no more fear of dangers and afflictions and the onset of winds, but is in calm. So also thy love—so long as thou art with men, expect afflictions and dangers and the onset of *noetic* winds. But when thou attainest the things that are prepared for thee, then shalt thou be without fear. But in regard to what I said before, that our Master said, "*Behold I will send my angel before thy face*"—sent he was. But in regard to thy not finding handiwork—God said in the Mosaic book, "*For this cause He led thee about and chastened thee and suffered thee to hunger in that terrible wilderness, to know what was in thine heart.*"[21] Understand the things I say to thee, and labour steadily and without doubting, beloved brother.

IX. Letter of the same Great Old Man to the same when he had gone away on business of the Cenobium, and had become heedless because of the great affliction he had found therein:—

Write, my child, to our brother John salutation in the Lord from me and thee and our brother John, and say to him—*Faint not at the tribulations*[22] and the bodily toils which thou endurest, labouring for us and our Cenobium. For this also pertains to "*laying down one's life for*"[23] the brethren. And I hope that great will be the reward of this labour, and as God set Joseph to feed his brethren in famine in Egypt, so also He has set thee to succour the Cenobium, with our child Seridus. And I say to thee the Apostolic word to Timothy: "*Thou therefore, my child, be strengthened in the grace of the Holy Spirit.*"[24] For I am looking to thy quiet, how it is about to come, and I rejoice with thee in the Lord. For as long as thou livest outside, thou art bound to find affliction and bodily labour. But when thou attainest to the haven of quiet, thou findest refreshment and peace. For our Master cannot lie, who says, "*I will give unto them in this present world an hundredfold, and in the world to come life everlasting.*"[25] Eagerly therefore labour, my brother, that thou mayest find the more love and refreshment. For before the ship reaches the haven, it is beaten and tossed by the waves and billows. But if it reach there, it is found henceforth in great calm. Consider what I am saying, and keep it: for *may the Lord give thee understanding in all things.*[26]

[21] Deut. viii. 2–3; xxxii. 10.
[22] Eph. iii. 13.
[23] John xv. 13.
[24] 2 Tim. ii. 1.
[25] Mark x. 30.
[26] 2 Tim. ii. 7.

X. Answer of the same Great Old Man to the same, when a stone had fallen on his foot and caused him much pain and disheartenment:—

To the beloved brother John in the Lord, greeting. According to the labour of thy body for our sake, and the crushing of thy spirit for God's sake, may our Master God fill thy soul, my beloved, with the good things of heaven *an hundredfold*. Observe what is written to thee from me, brother, and hide it with thyself. For I will cause thee to hear heavenly joy from our Master and God. For in the name of the Holy Trinity I find that thou art joint-heir of my grace-gifts that are given to me from God. And I am expectant that step by step thou wilt speedily attain to them. For there is the man who for labour according to God speedily attains *unto his rest*[27]: and there is again the man who attains to it for his humility. But I hope that thou wilt have both these, when wrath has died out of thee, anger being choked from thy heart: and then is fulfilled in thee the word that is written—*"Look on my humility and my labour, and forgive me all my sins."*[28] And since I have said that step by step thou attainest, observe the Gospels, how and how often Christ gave the grace-gifts to His Disciples, concerning healings and castings out of demons, for the perfection speaking to them concerning remission of sins—*"Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted."*[29] If then for thy labour for God He will remit thy sins, this is the measure which I wish thee to achieve. But if thou readest in the letter words hard to understand, ask thy twin soul and my beloved son, Seridus, and by the grace of God he will explain to thee what is hard to understand. For I have prayed God for him concerning this also. Thou therefore, O man of God, ceaselessly run the way that is prepared for thee, so that with joy thou mayest reach that haven of Christ which we have reached, and hear that voice full of joy and of life and of exultation saying to thee, *"Well done, good and faithful servant: thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will set thee over many things: enter thou into the joy of the Lord."*[30] Mayest thou rejoice in the Lord: mayest thou rejoice in the Lord: mayest thou rejoice in the Lord. The Lord shall keep thy soul and body and spirit from every evil, and from every diabolic opposition, and every disturbing imagination. The Lord shall be thy light, thy protection, thy way, thy strength, crown of rejoicing, and everlasting help. Give heed to thyself: for it is written, *"And what is gone out of my lips I will not set aside."*[31]

XI. Answer of the same Great Old Man to the same, counselling him to call to mind continually the things written to him for his profit and the establishment of his heart:—

Solomon said about his parents: *"Who taught me also, and said unto me, Let our word stand fast in thy heart."*[32] So I also say to thee, brother,

[27] Heb. iii. 18, etc.
[28] Ps. xxv. (xxiv.) 18.
[29] John xx. 23.
[30] Matt. xxv. 23.
[31] Ps. lxxxix. (lxxxviii.) 34.
[32] Prov. iv. 4.

Let my words stand fast in thy heart, and meditate continually all that is written to thee from me; as God said by the mouth of Moses—"*Thou shalt bind them upon thy right hand, and they shall be unmoved before thine eyes continually; and meditate them when thou liest down and when thou risest up, and when thou walkest in the way and when thou sittest in thine house.*"[33] Show then these same in perfection of works. And my God shall be with thee unto the ages. Amen.

XII. The Same enjoined a work upon a brother. And as he did not do it quickly, he rebuked him. And when the brother was grieved, he thought he would not say anything at all to any of the brethren any more. And in regard to this the Old Man informed him thus:—

Say to brother John, This time is soft, and thou wilt have much labour to find in this present time a man having a firm heart. But hold the word of the holy Apostle when he says, "*Reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering and doctrine.*"[34]

XIII. When some building was being done in the Cenobium, he, as he was skilled in this, fixed the measures of the work. And without his knowledge some of the brethren, supposing they would be doing a good thing, added to them and somewhat spoilt them. And when he was vexed, and grew tired of them, the Old Man informed them thus:—

Say to brother John, who is of one mind with us—Many are the things written to thee from me by the hand of our true and beloved child, who from his whole soul loves us three equally in perfect love. And all these I write not of my own will, but of the command of the Holy Spirit, and all for profit and correction of soul and of the conscience of thy inner man, but for affliction and chastening of thy body, and contrition of thy heart. First give heed against the spirit of *accidie*: for it begets every evil and shifty matter. For if I write to thee the temptations I have endured, still I say unto thee that thine ears cannot bear it—but perhaps neither the ears of any other at this present time. But I hope that thou wilt attain thereunto: and not only so, but that thou hast to see them with thine own eyes, and be redeemed from them by grace of Christ through faith. Why does thy heart faint with growing tired of Christ's sheep? Or dost thou not know what a headache the good teacher endures from the children until they pass the test? And this that thou hast heard from me the Apostolic saying, "*Reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering and doctrine*"—hear, and give heed to what I say to thee. Long-suffering is mother of all good things. Observe how Moses chose for himself *rather to suffer affliction with the people of God than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season*.[35] Therefore when there troubles thee a thought from the demon in regard to any man, say to the thought with long-suffering, "Did I become subject to God in order that I might enslave others?" and it will

[33] Deut. vi. 7–8; xi. 18–19.
[34] 2 Tim. iv. 2.
[35] Heb. xi. 25.

cease from thee. Run steadfastly and mightily, remembering my words—or rather, the Lord's words—that thou also mayest overtake us in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen. So be it: so be it.

XIV. Answer of the same Great Old Man to the Same because he took it heavily when he heard that one of the brethren, as in disparagement of him was saying, "And who is this man, or where does he come from, that he is so distressed?"—

Say to the brother—As *Michael contended about the body of Moses,*[36] so do I strive on thy behalf until thou be set free from the old man. For the Jews murmured about the Saviour, saying, *"Is not this the son of Joseph? Do we not know his mother and his brethren?"*[37] Take these things to heart, and endure unto the end.

XV. Answer of the same Great Old Man to the Same when he was not yet clear of this same disheartenment:—

Say to the brother—I remember the prophecy of the holy Prophet Jeremiah when he says, *"Who will give waters to my head, and to mine eyes a fountain of tears, and I will weep for this people day and night?"*[38] For I was expecting to feed thee on solid food, and I see thee again needing milk. Look what is written, *"And cleanse thou me from my secret faults."*[39] Look lest the evil dragons steal thee, and shoot into thee their venom: for it is deadly. For no man ever corrects the good by an evil: for he is overcome by the evil. But he corrects the evil by the good. See therefore, thou standest in the lists. It is thy duty to *fight with beasts* like the Apostle *at Ephesus.*[40] For he was boasting after conquering the wild beasts. Thou hast been cast into the turmoil of the sea, to endure many dangers, and to strive together against the billowing of the waves. And so when thou hast conquered with the help of God, thou wilt enter with us into the haven of calm, in Christ Jesus our Lord, to whom is the glory unto the ages. Amen.

XVI. Answer of the same Great Old Man to the same when he was going to be vexed against the brethren at the spoiling of the bricks which had been brought about by the rain. For he attributed this to their own indolence. And foreseeing that he was also going to blame the Abbot about this, he cautions him beforehand, and rouses him up to secure his thoughts, reminding him also of the true love which the Abbot had for him, that with such a reminder he might thrust away the contrary thought:—

Do me a charity, my child, and make haste to bring paper and ink, and leave aside the business for which thou art come up, and write to brother John, in the first place, greeting from me. For he is being worked on to

[36] Jude 9.
[37] Luke iv. 22; John vi. 42, etc.
[38] Jer. ix. 1.
[39] Ps. xix. (xviii.) 12.
[40] 1 Cor. xv. 32.

trouble others and be troubled by them. And say to him—Mayest thou rejoice in the Lord, my brother. If many are the waves of the sea, is there none who will rouse Jesus from sleep, that He may *rebuke the winds and the sea*, and there may be *calm* for us to understand and to *worship*[41] Jesus? If all things are vain and temporary, why is our heart worked upon through them to become forgetful of the Gospel saying, "*What shall a man be profited if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?*"[42] Learn, my brother, that if a man distress another whether by word or by deed, afterwards he himself is distressed an hundredfold. And often have been written to thee from me the words of the Scripture of the Lord to *be long-suffering in all things*,[43] and to give heed that thy will be not mixed with anything. But if thou send me the question with my beloved son Seridus, who is ever distressed when he sees thee distressed, study to make accurate account with thy thoughts, lest they should ever shoot deadly venom into thy heart, so that thou shouldest be led astray, thinking the *gnat* a *camel*, and the grit a stone, and the man is found having the *beam* and giving heed to the *mote*.[44]

I write to thee as to my own soul. For I know that thy heart is able to rejoice at these things. For it is said, "*Reprove a wise man . . .*"[45] *et seq*. And thou knowest how I have thee in the Love of Christ, brother. I hope that thou art nigh to be carefree henceforth from earthly matters, and to be found occupied in the spiritual work of the fathers. For my Lord Christ will not put me to shame when I am praying Him day and night for thee.

XVII. Question of the Same to the same Great Old Man:— I know, Father, that these things come to me because of my sins, and that I am senseless and the cause of ills. But he who brings me to this distress is the Abbot, because he is careless, and overlooks matters, and they are spoilt by his fault, and I cannot bear it. But what shall I do? For I answer the thoughts, and I do not receive power. And forgive me that "Once have I spoken, but to the second time I will not add."[46] *But I marvel how that fervour of love which I had for the brethren is grown cold. And pray for me for the Lord's sake.*

Answer:—

Brother, remember that the Lord said to His own Disciples, "*Are ye also without understanding?*"[47] I wrote to thee saying, "Make accurate account with thy thoughts." If thou hadst toiled to make accurate account, thou couldest have learnt that the essence of what thou hast just written to me I had written to thee before, and there was no need for me to write. But all the same I will add to thee in answer to thy questions. Thou calledst thyself a sinner, and in thy deeds thou didst not hold thyself so.

[41] Matt. viii. 26; xiv. 33.
[42] Matt. xvi. 26.
[43] 1 Thes. v. 14.
[44] Matt. xxiii. 24; vii. 3.
[45] Prov. ix. 8.
[46] Job xl. 5 (xxxix. 35).
[47] Matt. xv. 16.

For he who holds that he is a sinner and the cause of ills, does not contradict any, does not fight, is not angry against any man, but holds all to be better than himself and more intelligent. And if thy thoughts mock thee that thou art thus, how do they move thy heart against those who are better than thou? Give heed, brother: it is not the truth. For we have not yet attained to hold ourselves sinners. If any one loves him who reproves him, he is a wise man. But if any one love and does not do what he hears from him, this is rather hatred. If thou art a sinner, why dost thou blame thy neighbour and bring him in cause, saying that it is through him that the distress is come to thee? Dost thou not know that each man is tried by his own conscience, and it is this that gives birth to his distress? And this is what I wrote to thee about the brethren, "Let them not show thee a *gnat* as a *camel*," etc. But pray rather that ye may be fellow-partakers in the fear of God. But as for thy calling thyself senseless—search out, and thou wilt find that it is not thus. For if thou firmly holdest it to be so, then neither hast thou any right to be angry, not being able to distinguish whether a matter has fallen out well or ill. For the senseless man is called a fool. And the senseless and foolish is interpreted "saltless." And how shall the "saltless" season and salt others? See, brother, that we are mocked, and speak with our mouth only, and our deeds show it. But when we make answer to the thoughts, we do not receive power, since first we accept to condemn our neighbour, and the power of our spirit is enfeebled, and we bring our brother in cause when we ourselves are to blame. If thou holdest that everything is in the hands *of God who showeth mercy*, and *not of him that willeth nor of him that runneth*,[48] why dost thou not understand, and love thy brother with thy whole heart, in perfect love? For how many have desired us Old Men, and have run, and it was not granted them! And he sat still, and God sent us to him, and made him our true child.

But as for thy saying, "*Once have I spoken*," etc.—if thou fight to obtain, thou art blessed. For it has not been given to all. And about the other thoughts—refer to God every thought, saying, "God knows what is profitable," and thou wilt be refreshed, and little by little there comes to thee power to endure. And do not completely cut off speaking. But and if thou speakest and art not listened to, nor findest favour in thy word, be not grieved: for it profits thee rather. But in regard to thy marvelling—perfect love is without falling, and he who obtains it remains in its fervour, enclosed in Love to God and to his neighbour. But in regard to the prayers of which thou wrotest at the end—thou oughtest to be satisfied with the word I wrote to thee, that night and day I pray without ceasing unto God concerning thee. So this also it was superfluous for thee to write. Thou hast therefore from me food according to God for a long time. Persevere, and *wait patiently for the Lord*, in Christ Jesus our Lord, to whom be the glory unto the ages. Amen.

XVIII. Answer of the same Great Old Man to the same when he asked

[48] Rom. ix. 16.

whence come warmth and coldness, and the hardness of heart, and about the bodily warfare:—

About warmth and coldness—it is clear that the Lord was named *fire*, warming and setting on fire *hearts and reins*.[49] If it be so then, the devil also is cold, and from him comes all coldness. For if it were not so, how does He say, *"Then shall the love of many wax cold"?*[50] What is the *"Then"* if it is not "in the times of the adversary"? Therefore if we perceive coldness, let us call upon God, and He comes and warms our heart unto His perfect Love, not only towards Him but also towards our neighbour. And from the face of His warmth the coldness of the hater of good is banished. For if he has dried up the fount of the tears of thy heart, and moistened thy underbelly, yet do thou feast the Lord *in thy house*,[51] and He will dry up this last, and cleanse the fount of tears for the flowing of the *noetic* water. He who desires to come to the fear of God, comes by patience. For it says, *"I waited patiently for the Lord, and He inclined unto me and heard my calling"*; and what? *"And he brought me up out of the horrible pit, out of the mire and clay."*[52] From such a pit we can understand also the hardness of heart.

If therefore thou desirest, obtain and thou art saved, in Christ Jesus our Lord.

XIX. Answer of the Same Great Old Man to the Same about Long-suffering:—

Say to the brother—I wrote to thee about long-suffering, and now I say to thee: Our Master God said to His own Disciples, *"Behold I have given unto you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy: and nothing shall by any means hurt you."*[53] Become therefore like Job, *"drinking up scorning like water."*[54] Understand these things, and meditate upon them continually.

XX. Answer of the Same Great Old Man to the Same when he asked, "If the Lord has given 'power to tread on serpents and scorpions,' how then is it that I am stirred?":—

No one who has received *"power to tread on serpents and scorpions"* is hurt any longer or mastered by them. Search out therefore thy heart in regard to every matter. If it can stir thy heart even for a moment, learn that thou art still far from receiving power against these. And be not careless for thyself, lest the time forestall thee: but whatever thing thou seest coming to pass (why should I speak about the things of the world, since they are passing away? But I speak about fearful things, whether in heaven or on earth), set God and the Judgement before thine eyes, and that we have but a little time to spend in this world. And make meekness

[49] Deut. iv. 24; Ps. vii. 10.
[50] Matt. xxiv. 10, 12.
[51] Luke xix. 5.
[52] Ps. xl. (xxxix.) 1–2.
[53] Luke x. 19.
[54] Job. xv. 16; xxxiv. 7.

to rest in thine heart, remembering Christ the sheep and guileless lamb, how many things He endured, though He was guiltless,—insults, scourgings, and the rest:—but we, since we are guilty also, why are we stirred against our neighbour, when he has done us no wrong? Remember that "*Love vaunteth not itself,*" but "*suffereth long,*"[55] etc. And pray to attain to what is set before thee, that thy labour may not be in vain. Cleave therefore without doubting to the Christ who loves us. To him be the Glory unto the ages. Amen.

XXI. Answer of the same Great Old Man to the same when he had it in mind not to enjoin anything on any man, but to define for himself some clear matter, that he might have care for it and it only:—

Brother, as I write to thee the more, so do thou the more study to understand the things written to thee from me, and do not set them aside. For they are spoken in understanding and settled condition of soul. Thou knowest, brother, that whoever does not bear insults, does not see the Glory, and whoever does not lay aside bitterness, does not taste the sweetness. Thou hast been given into the midst of the brethren and of affairs to be fired and proved. For gold is not proved except by fire. Set thyself absolutely no ordinance—for it will bring thee into warfare and anxiety—but approving what fits each time in the fear of God, and doing *nothing* at all *in contentiousness*,[56] but doing what thou canst to be alien from anger, and *becoming a pattern*[57] profitable to all, not judging nor condemning any, but admonishing them as true brothers. And rather love those who try thee. For I too was often loving those who tried me. For if we understand, such as these bring us to progress. Set then no ordinance upon thyself. Become obedient and humble: and require of thyself every day: for the Prophet also signified the *daily* rule when he said, "*And I said, Now have I begun*"[58]; and Moses, "*And now O Israel.*"[59] Do thou also therefore keep the *now*. But and if there arise necessity for thee to enjoin something upon any man, prove thy thought: if it is going to issue with stirring of thy heart, though it seem to thee profitable, hide it under thy tongue, remembering at once Him who said, "*What shall a man be profited if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?*" But learn this, my brother, that every thought that has not in the first place the calm of humility, is not according to God, but is manifestly the very righteousness of the left-hand. For our Lord comes with calmness, and all the things of the adversary with vexation and stirring of anger. Though they seem to put on *sheep's clothing*, learn that *inwardly they are ravening wolves*.[60] From their vexation they are made manifest. For He says, "*From their fruits ye shall know them.*"[61] May God grant to you all to understand, so that ye may not be led astray into their righteousness. For

[55] 1 Cor. xiii. 4.
[56] Phil. ii. 3.
[57] 1 Tim. iv. 12.
[58] Ps. lxxvii. (lxxvi.) 10.
[59] Deut. iv. 1; x. 12.
[60] Matt. vii. 15.
[61] Ibid. 16.

All things are naked and opened[62] unto Him. Do thou therefore, beloved, do everything that is prospered in thy hands, setting the fear of God before thine eyes, and giving thanks to Him. For His is the glory and the honour and the might and the power unto the ages. Amen.

XXII. Answer of the same Great Old Man to the Same, having encouragement, and recalling him to spiritual gladness from the disheartenment that had come upon him in divers manners:—

Write to brother John a spiritual address gladdening his heart in Christ Jesus our Lord: and say to him—Since "*Like as the hart longeth after the water-brooks,*"[63] so thou longest after us—yet not as we after thee—so "*I could no longer forbear,*"[64] as the divine Apostle Paul said, and have written to your love these things spoken from me, or rather from God. May thy vine bear fruit, grapes trodden and making spiritual wine to gladden the afflicted soul. May thy land bear plentifully good seed like that which was *sown in good ground and brought forth some an hundredfold, some sixty, some thirty.*[65] And may the spiritual fire be heated in thy heart continually, whereof our Master Christ said, "*I am come to send fire upon the earth.*"[66] And *may the peace of the Lord rule in thy heart,*[67] according to the Apostolic word. And may thy palm-tree be exalted in its own *leucada,* as David says, "*The righteous shall flourish like a palm-tree.*"[68] And mayest thou be cleansed from anger and wrath, those dread passions, like the perfect saints, in whom the stirring of these appears not at all even for a moment. And may the Lord vouchsafe *thy soul to be lodged*[69] in guilelessness and meekness, so that thou mayest be a nursling of Christ, a guileless sheep. And mayest thou follow our tracks like a clever tracker. And mayest thou overtake our rule as a good inheritor of our grace-gifts. And may thine eyes *see God,* as one who is *pure in heart.*[70] And mayest thou be long-suffering in tribulations, as one who has reached to the Master's precept which says, "*In the world ye shall have tribulation; but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world.*" And mayest thou attain that invincible Love which brings those who have obtained it into the royal courts, and makes them brothers of Christ. *If* then *thou sufferest with Christ, that thou mayest be also glorified with him; if thou diest with him,*[71] that thou mayest be *raised up with him*[72]; neglect not the treasure that is set before thee. For still thou hast not grasped its meaning, what it is. But when thou attainest the perfect quiet, then thou shalt know it, and wonder at the gift of Christ, *how unsearchable are his ways.*[73] For whiles thou art with men thou canst not grasp these things.

[62] Heb. iv. 13.
[63] Ps. xlii. (xli.) 1.
[64] 1 Thess. iii. 5.
[65] Mark iv. 8.
[66] Luke xii. 49.
[67] Col. iii. 15.
[68] Ps. xcii. (xci.) 12.
[69] Ps. xxv. (xxiv.) 13.
[70] Matt. v. 8.
[71] Rom. viii. 17.
[72] 2 Tim. ii. 11; Col. ii. 12.
[73] Rom. xi. 33.

But when thou art sitting care-free like us, then thou graspest these things whereof we have spoken. For I pray God night and day that where we are, there thou mayest be with us of one accord, in the unutterable joy of the righteous, and in the everlasting light; that thou mayest find thy portion in the promise promised to the saints, where "*Eye has not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God has prepared for them that love Him.*"[74] Have strength in the Lord. Mayest thou rejoice. Amen.

[*To be continued*]

REVIEW

VISION AND ACTION by L. A. Zander, with an Introduction by the Bishop of Chichester. Translated from the Russian by Natalie Duddington. Victor Gollancz Ltd., London 1952. P. 224. 18/-.

In a brief review it is obviously impossible to state adequately all doubts and objections which even a cursory reading of this book cannot fail to provoke. A closer examination of the argument only increases the initial embarrassment. It is a very personal book. In no way is it typical of the Orthodox position. It is, in a sense, "a voice from the East," but what this voice has to tell is neither "Eastern," nor "Orthodox." The author has been trained and reared in a certain particular tradition, and his treatment of the "Ecumenical Reality" is heavily coloured by his peculiar convictions. One may question whether these convictions are compatible at all with the basic tenets of the Catholic Faith. One may ask further, whether the new conception of "Ecumenism" sponsored by the author is compatible with the main principles of the historical "Ecumenical Movement." In fact, the author does not seem to take much interest in the problems either of "Faith," or of "Order." He chooses to dwell beyond dogmas, canons, or rites. "Ecumenism," as conceived by the author, is "essentially mystical." It is not concerned with "external events," nor is it interested in historical achievements. "The unity which is its aim is a unity of love, unrealizable in any historical form, but promised in the life of the world to come" (44). In this sense, ecumenism is "an anticipation of the kingdom" (222). Ecumenism is essentially paradoxical and metalogical. "Ecumenism is possible only in spite of logic, or, rather, independently of it" (38). Historical planning is disavowed and discouraged. Even theological discussion is discouraged: such an exercise in "comparative theology" only stiffens the schism. "This work can scarcely be called ecumenical" (210). No "healing of the schism" is possible in history, nor should it be attempted at all. "Historical interpretation of ecumenism is only possible on the basis of historical optimism and faith in progress (at least in ecumenical progress)." The author disbelieves in the possibility of any ecumenical advance on the level of history. One is invited to indulge in a sort of an "eschatological" vision, and there is no call to a sober and responsible action. One may hesitate: is not this "vision" rather a

[74] 1 Cor. ii. 9.

romantic dream? "The eschatological interpretation, on the other hand, is independent of all historical failures. The prospect of "always be divided" is not terrifying for it; the whole history of the Church is the history of divisions and cannot therefore be regarded as a kind of preface to the still unwritten book on unity; the historical tragedy of Christianity is an inevitable condition of sinful humanity—and it is this sinful reality that is the object of eternal transfiguration and of future *parousia*" (45). The author obviously overlooks the fact that "visible unity," and precisely "unity in the faith," is one of the marks of the Church according to the New Testament teaching, and that the Church had been intended by Christ to be "the pillar and the ground of the truth." There is no question of an "inevitable" progress, but rather of a bounden duty, and of an impending and positive task. It is interesting to compare the author's statements with what has been recently said by another writer on Ecumenism, whose book appeared almost at the same time as the one we discuss. It is a Norrisian Prize essay by William Nicholls, *Ecumenism and Catholicity* (S.C.M. Press Ltd., London 1952). Comparison is pertinent, as both writers start from the same "experience" and have the same background (W.S.C.M.). Only Mr. Nicholls obviously has had a wider theological training and more of ecclesiastical sense. Accordingly he states: "Division amongst Christians is not a necessary consequence of their historical existence. Since Christ, sin and history are not to be equated. . . . Sin in Church history is a fact, even a permanent fact, but it is not inevitable. . . . The ecumenical movement is the renewal of the consciousness that this state of affairs is scandalous and utterly abnormal. Its inherent drive towards unity in history, however conceived, is its movement of repentance" (Nicholls, pp. 54–55). It is precisely this spirit of repentance that is missing in the book we review. "Divided Christendom" is taken to be an inevitable and ultimate fact of history. Nothing can be done about it at all. On the whole, a very peculiar sort of "Ecumenism" is advocated, which has very little in common with the actual Ecumenical endeavour of Christian Churches. The driving power of this endeavour has always been a desperate search for "Christian Reunion." It was a search for a "common mind." Whether this goal can be attained in history, and whether it can be attained by the means and methods adopted in the Ecumenical Movement, is another question. In any case, the main preoccupation of the Ecumenical Movement was always with the Unity of the Church. Now, it is precisely this preoccupation that is disavowed by the author. He advocates a "Unity without Union," i.e., Unity in dis-Union, or in dis-agreement. No agreement can be ever reached on a historical level, and therefore all attempts at agreement are pointless and futile, and even dangerous, from the author's point of view. The author is very eloquent in his plea against "proselytism," which he identifies with "conversion." Everybody should stay in the confession in which he happened to be born or brought up. "A necessary postulate of ecumenical reality" is, according to the author, not only abstention from "proselytism" (in the current and pejorative meaning of the word), but also from theological argument altogether, as the latter is no more than a

subtle form of spiritual violence or pressure. "In practice it means that, although I see that my brother is erring, I make no attempt to disabuse him of his errors and to set him in the way of truth" (113). Disputes about faith are "merely a kind of game of chess" (110). All this is described as one of the finest achievements of "ecumenical love." Is it not rather a drastic example of a "stony insensibility," of a complete lack of love both to the "erring brother," and to the Catholic Truth? The author protests that his attitude is "neither compromise nor relativism," but just a normal *modus vivendi*, "i.e. a conscious attitude of freedom and tolerance towards all Christians, which is essential to ecumenical life" (118). Strangely enough, he expects to build on this foundation an "ecumenical communion." He extends indefinitely the scope and range of this peculiar "communion." He wants to include "Liberal Christians" and to make "ecumenical communion" available for all who "want to be Christians and to be called so," regardless of their actual convictions about Christ. The only question should be asked: "Do you profess to be Christian, do you want to bear Christ's name?" And again: "Do you want to be in communion with other Christians, do you feel somehow connected with 'other sheep which are not of this fold' but also follow Christ?" An affirmative answer to these very vague questions, in the opinion of the author, would be quite sufficient "for being received into ecumenical communion" (176ff.). The author is dissatisfied with the limitations imposed on the membership in the Ecumenical "organizations": Christ to be acknowledged as God and Saviour. The "basis," doctrinal and discriminative, is obviously indispensable for an organization, but it only shows that no organization can cope adequately with the ecumenical reality, as the author conceives it. "We have no right to exclude from the grace of Christ those who love Him, even if merely in the sense of being attracted by His image and of taking a "scientific" interest in Him" (71). "However much the Christians might err about Christ and differ among themselves, His very name is the bond which, stronger than steel, links them with the disciples who in Antioch first called themselves Christians." He waves away a natural objection that obviously the same name may be used in different senses, and exclaims pathetically: "As though human frailty or foolishness could annul or weaken the power inherent in God's Name. As though the Name did not live and act of itself, apart from its right or wrong interpretation" (136 and n. 2). On the other hand, "the name 'Christian' indicates that which is most essential in man: the direction of his will, the highest spiritual value recognized by him, the object of his love and service" (179). There is some obvious confusion in these statements. The author is probably consistent, from his own point of view. Of course, "ecumenical communion," based as it is in his interpretation on the principle of equality of all conflicting doctrines (and the author frankly admits that they *are* conflicting, if only on the plane of "logic"), would be immediately disrupted if its members dare to go beyond indifference. But does it not simply reveal the initial fallacy of the whole scheme? "Direction of the will" cannot be independent of the conception one has of "the object of his love," and

therefore cannot be the same if these conceptions contradict and exclude each other. It is obviously not the same to believe wholeheartedly what is professed in the Nicene Creed, and to take "a 'scientific' interest" in a Galilean prophet. Can the "direction of the will" be the same in both cases? Would the author include in his "ecumenical communion" people like the famous pastor Kalthoff who wanted to continue his ministry in a Christian community, while denying that Jesus ever lived? Kalthoff was prepared to call himself "Christian," in some sense. And why exclude then from the projected "ecumenical communion" those advanced Jews who not only took "scientific interest" in Jesus, but were prepared to consider Him as one of the greatest moralists of the Jewish race (e.g., Claude Montefiore or J. Klausner)? A friend of mine, a prominent theological professor, suggested to me on one occasion that the true difference between a certain "Christian liberal" and a Rabbi was that the Rabbi was consistent and the alleged "Christian" utterly inconsistent. But the author goes much further than "tolerance" may require. He suggests that, after all, divergent conceptions being about the "same" reality, all of them are partial revelations of Christ Himself. Not only there are certain grains of Truth in all of them, but ultimately it is Christ Himself who manifests Himself in this chaos and confusion of human misinterpretations. "Divided Christendom," with all its historical internecine strife and disruption, turns out to be an authentic "Revelation," or simply a new "*Christophania.*" "It really is a revelation: in it our spiritual eyes really open to the vision of the hitherto invisible image of Christ in the Christians" (207). This new "Ecumenical revelation" overshadows everything that can be discovered in the historical dimension, on "the phenomenal plane of the Church's existence," as the author puts it (201), i.e. in the "institutional" Church, in dogmas, rules, and rites. Everything becomes a genuine "image" of Christ. One only has to acquire a new vision, "independently of logic." One may suggest: and independently of truth also. One may wonder, whether St. Athanasius and Ernest Renan really spoke of "the same Christ." The author suggests actually that the Pantocrator of the Byzantine ikon and Ude's Galilean are "images" of the same Christ (208). A prominent Russian philosopher of the last century tells in his memoirs that in his boyhood he lost the faith and on one occasion intimated to his mother that he "respected Jesus." The mother, not yet acquainted with the new "ecumenical postulate," burst into tears. For her it was a blasphemy. In the new "ecumenical" interpretation it was but one of the legitimate expressions of the Christian discipleship. It seems, however, that the old unsophisticated lady knew better, what was Christianity. It is difficult to see how can one be "Christian," if all dogmas, canons, and Dominical institutions are deliberately rejected and set aside as "human accretions" or even as "superstitions." Plurality of interpretations is a poor escape. Of course, in the "ecumenical communion" advocated by the author one has to reason "independently of logic" and look at things without discerning them. But many readers of the book will be unable to "sacrifice their reason," and to dilute their faith. They may consider the

offer of a *sacrificio del inteletto* just as an act of pressure and violence. Their protest will probably never reach the author who would take refuge in "the Paradoxical" and convict his opponents of "confessional rigidity" of spiritual shortsight, or blindness. The question still remains: how could an "ecumenical communion" be built on the shifting sands of human opinions? The author actually speaks of this "communion," to which one may belong in spite of an utter dissension in the matters of belief with the other members of this singular "Society," which is not a closed one. And this "Society" (the author himself writes the word with a capital "S," although he puts it in inverted commas) possesses a deeper insight into the ultimate Mystery of God than all "institutional" Churches, or denominations, can ever attain, being imprisoned in the narrow limits of "dogmas, canons, and rites" (211),—"Churches" in plural, because for the author "one Christian Church" (and one is deeply moved by his suicidal frankness) simply "does not exist" (30). The author seems to cherish his acquired membership in this new "Society" more than his "confessional loyalty" to that "Church" in which he happened to be baptized (just by the accident of his being born in an Orthodox family in Russia). Of course, he is not going to transfer his "confessional loyalty." One should stay wherever one happens to be. He would even praise the distinctive ethos and promote the distinctive contribution of "his own Church"—one of the many existing. All "confessions" ultimately reflect the same "mystery." Yet, he would exclude all "confessional" features from his prayer for Christian Unity. This prayer would be insincere unless all who join "completely renounce their confessional ideals." Unity should know no limitations. "But this liberation of prayer from all concrete content, from all church imagery, means rising to spiritual heights accessible only to a few" (156). This prayer is bound to be "apophatic," and probably not a prayer of the Unity of the *Church*, as it is impossible to conceive a "church" without any concrete features. The real difficulty is created for the author by the phrase that "there should be one fold and one shepherd." There would be an obvious ambiguity if Roman Catholics, Orthodox and Protestants joined in the recitation of this phrase, because they would interpret it differently. "The ambiguity is not inevitable, for at great spiritual heights, where the air is rarefied and the pull of the earth is scarcely felt, we may be able to pray for unity as such, apart from its confessional interpretations" (157). It is not clear at all why the author is embarrassed by the "ambiguity" of words at this point, while he acquiesced so easily with it in any other connection. Why he was not upset by the fact that the "Name of Jesus" obviously had not the same connotation for an Orthodox and for "Liberal Christians" (at least, should have a different connotation). In any case, it is not clear what he makes of this scriptural phrase "One fold." Obviously, it refers to history, and not just to the "spiritual heights accessible only to a few." The author is concerned with a very particular problem which he unfortunately mistakes for the main problem of Ecumenism, namely with the problem of Ecumenical Encounter. It is a real problem, but it can be adequately grasped only in a historical

dimension. It is true that the Ecumenical Movement has created a "new atmosphere" in inter-Christian relations (20). People of various confessional loyalties and backgrounds are brought together and are compelled to face each other. The practical problem which inevitably arises is this: what is the meaning of this gathering together of disagreeing Christians and what should they think and do about each other, just as individuals? Our author has no hope of reconciling the divergent opinions and systems of belief. At the same time he is impressed by the friendliness of the encounter. Ecclesiastical barriers are insuperable. As there are many divergent systems, none should regard itself as the only true or consistent (24ff.). The argument is rather lame. Of many answers to the same question one may be true, in spite of the existence of other answers. The author chooses another way to meet the challenge of disruption. "My church is naturally regarded by me as the true Church—this is implied by my belonging to it; and, being the true Church, it is unique. But this does not give me the right to condemn other churches" (91). The real question is not what is "natural" to me, but what is true. The author unnecessarily complicates the problem by spurious presuppositions. In his interpretation, "faith," i.e. "the primary intuition," is "radically different from processes which we call knowledge" (126). Accordingly the "notes of the Church," *notae Ecclesiae*, "can never be objects of knowledge" (129). In other words, the Church can never be identified. One may have personal preference or assurance, and yet in no case can one objectively substantiate one's claim. The only solution is then "to seek for communion (between the rival confessions or churches) on paths that are not sacramental or canonical" (47), without rejecting those churches "as sacramentally canonical organizations." One has to cut across the existing confessions and start a new "ecumenical communion." Nevertheless, in a lengthy chapter on "The Problems of Ecumenism," our author deliberately chooses precisely the *notae Ecclesiae* as the headings under which he describes and analyses the new "Ecumenical Reality" (119–202). And finally he comes to the conclusion that the true key to the Ecumenical problem is "the idea of a single Christian world—Christendom." It is a metalogical idea and "does not form part of any ecclesiological doctrine and cannot be logically justified." Christendom is apparently identical with the alleged "ecumenical communion," or the new and open "Society." In any case, what cannot be accomplished in the categories of the Church ("one Church" does not exist) is accomplished in the categories of "Christendom" (which is one). "Christendom" replaces the "Church." "But since Christ knows those who want to be His disciples, and since His disciples, though disagreeing about everything else, are one in their desire to be faithful to their Master, *tota Christianitas* is a reality" (224). One should remember that this desire "to be faithful to the Master" can be expressed in any way one may select: from confessing Christ as "God and Saviour" to describing Him as a sentimental Galilean preacher or an unsuccessful Apocalypticist. One may well doubt the "reality" of *one* Christendom, based on such a foundation. How much is left of the true

Historic Christianity in this startling interpretation? A special chapter deals with "the presuppositions of Ecumenism" (understood in the author's sense). They are classified under four headings. First, there are "historical presuppositions." The main tension is not between the "Catholic" and "Protestant" attitudes, but between "the East" and "the West." In other words, the ultimate tension is not on the plane of faith or doctrine, but rather on the plane of cultural psychology. There is here a dangerous confusion. This "presupposition" simply abolishes the possibility of any sound Ecumenism. Christian Unity is simply impossible, since the East and the West must diverge. The historical excursus of the author is utterly poor (55ff.), just antiquated platitudes. The unity of a cultural "universe of discourse," contrary to what the author says, was broken not in the third century, but probably only in the eleventh, if not in the thirteenth. St. Hilary, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome were no less "Hellenistic" in their intellectual outlook than their "Greek" contemporaries, and in the spiritual formation of St. Augustine Platonism obviously played a greater role than "Roman Law," as again the true key to Aquinas's system is Aristotle, and not the *Pandects*, and one should not forget the Greek background even of Anselm. One should not forget that "Roman Law" was codified in Byzantium, under Justinian, and, on the other hand, Rome itself was thoroughly Byzantine up to the times of Charlemagne, if not even later. The antithesis of "West and East" belongs more to polemical and publicistic phraseology than to a sober historical thinking. For a millennium at least there was *one* world, in spite of all schisms and tensions, and tension between "East" and "West" at that time was by no means stronger than certain internal tensions in the East itself. Augustine in any case was closer to Origen than, on the other hand, Theodore of Mopsuestia to Cyril of Alexandria. Obviously, it was not a tension between "the Greek" and "the Latin," but between theological conceptions, which in no case can be simply reduced to cultural or simply psychological factors. Again, the Reformation certainly was a greater break, even psychologically, than the split between the Catholic West and the Orthodox East. The "Unity of the West" is grotesquely exaggerated by the author. "The East can think of the West only as a whole" (74). Yes, but only when "the East" loses the true and theological perspective and mistakes itself for a "Greco-Slavonic type" of Christianity. Unexpectedly, the author suggests that Western Christians may understand Orthodoxy better if they study "innumerable sects," obviously outside the fold of the Church (75). He seems to mistake "the East" for "Orthodoxy." "Historical morphology" is a cheap substitute for a theological analysis. The author suggests that the only legitimate starting point for an "ecumenical conversation" can be found "in the depths of mystical experience, in prayer and direct knowledge of God" (19). Is it not rather in the historical Revelation, as recorded in the Scripture and attested by the consensus of the "Church Universal," that a true Christian conversation takes its start and foundation? In the second place some "logical presuppositions" are mentioned, of which the most important is "Confessionalism." It is not clear at all why it is a "logical pre-

supposition." What is contended is very simple. Divisions are to be taken as they exist, and no denomination should be "denied." "The idea of the sinfulness of division must be considerably modified" (86–87). Next, in the third place, come "psychological presuppositions." Under this heading an important postulate of the new "ecumenism" is brought in. "Ecumenism" is described as "love for heretics" (99ff.). Obviously, "heretics," as persons, cannot be excluded from the universality of Christian love, the test of which is "love for enemies." In this sense there will be no difficulty for a conscientious Christian to love his "erring brother," as there was no difficulty for the Crucified Lord to pray for the crucifiers. But the author has something different in mind: he wants to love "heretics" precisely for their heresy, i.e., for those distinctive features which separate them from the rest of the Christians, in order to rejoice in the fact that even heresy does not estrange people from Christ, if only they invoke His name in some sense. "Holiness" is possible in heresy no less than in the Church: "unorthodox, separated from the Church, but genuine holiness by the grace of God" (189). One may come to the conclusion that the Church is not "necessary for salvation." And, finally, come "ethical presuppositions," i.e. the thesis of the non-permissibility of conversions. Many readers will put this book away with a shudder and in despair. As it stands, it is a treacherous and misleading book. If it was meant to be an introduction into Ecumenism, it is precisely a wrong guide. In fact, it is the most anti-ecumenical book recently published, much more so than any hostile attack on Ecumenism. It denies the very possibility of an ecumenical action. It destroys the presuppositions of the Ecumenical work. The Ecumenical Movement, however great and ominous are its shortcomings, was inspired by a noble vision of a noble goal: The Unity of the Church. It is but true that the way is not yet found, and the goal is still variously conceived or misconceived. But now it is suggested that there is no goal, and should be no goal. "Since unity is not an external event but an inner achievement, it cannot be made the purpose of systematic work" (220–221). An exhilarating sign of the recent times is a recovery of a deeper understanding of the Church. No notice of this theological achievement, which is also an immense spiritual advance, is taken in the book under discussion. The author was not interested in the "ecclesiological aspect" of Ecumenism. He does not say anything about the recent study of the doctrine of the Church in the Ecumenical Movement. In this respect his book is a reactionary book; it takes us back—into the mists of a Romantic revivalism. It is a most untimely book, in an age when one is living, as has been aptly said, "in the midst of uncertainties and on the edge of an abyss." It is a common feeling of an overwhelming majority of Christians that the only hope for the world lies in the recovery of a "common mind." We live in an age of a rapidly growing disintegration. The Church has an immediate responsibility for the crisis. In this new interpretation of "Ecumenism" the historical task and vocation of the Church is dangerously obscured. There is no sense of tragedy in the book. Tragedy is smoothed by a "mystical," or, rather, dreamy interpretation. "Ecumenical suffering," of which the author

(Reggio). His co-consecrators included Mgr. Silvester, titular Bishop of Messina. We are reminded that Mgr. Cassian, Rector of the Institut St. Serge, is titular Bishop of Catania. We hope in our next issue to publish an article giving something of the historical background to these titles. Our best wishes go to the new Bishop. His consecration will help to lighten the heavy burden which lies upon the shoulders of Mgr. Athenagoras.

The New Year number of *Pantainos* (the weekly periodical of the Patriarchate of Alexandria) contains an article on "The Russian Orthodox Church and the Idea and Essence of Autocephaly," by the Archimandrite Parthenios Koinidis, in which the claims and attitude of the Ecumenical Patriarchate are strongly upheld against Russian criticism and counter-claims, particularly in relation to Polish autocephaly.

BULGARIA. News of the re-establishment of the Bulgarian Patriarchate is commented on later in this issue.

YUGOSLAVIA. We publish in this issue the new Yugoslav Law in regard to religious bodies, preceded by some comments from a correspondent. His remarks in reference to Cardinal Stepinac will be noticed. We publish them because we feel it to be important that it should be known that there are other points of view on this matter, adopted by informed Christians in Yugoslavia and elsewhere, besides the Roman Catholic. For the expression of the latter, we would refer to *Tito and the Catholic Church*, by Michael Derrick (published by The Sword of the Spirit, 6d.), and to the current number of *The Eastern Churches Quarterly* (Vol. X, No. 2, Summer 1953), which contains a valuable and informative leading article on the subject by the Editor, who quotes at length from Mr. Kitson Clark's "Note on General Principles," published in our last issue. For an Orthodox point of view, we print here a letter from an Orthodox who was in Yugoslavia during and after the War. He writes:—

"I quite agree with the author of *Tito and the Catholic Church* that Cardinal Stepinac was arrested and sentenced because of his courageous pastoral letter, and not because of his conduct during the war. The trial was artificial. I read the Pastoral Letter myself at that time with great satisfaction, in general. But I think that some of his expressions in that letter were too extreme, and more of a political than a religious character. I do not think it wise for the Church to attack Communism as such, especially within a communist state: it is wrong to identify that political and social way of life as a whole with the anti-religious propaganda which is only one of its main characteristics. It would be much wiser to stand for our religious and spiritual truths on their own spiritual ground, without confusing our spiritual life and fight with any earthly policy. Such is the attitude adopted by the Orthodox Church, which has been leading with much success the Christians' enormous spiritual struggle for more than thirty years.

"And I cannot understand why such a courageous person as Cardinal Stepinac could not state publicly, or at least in a similar pastoral letter to his clergy, that it was wrong and un-Christian to force people to become

catholics against their will, and to kill them because they are not catholics. I see the point of saving people from death by accepting them into the Roman Catholic Church, even though it is against the canons to do so. But I cannot understand why the national head of that Church could not issue a pastoral letter publicly condemning such a policy of a government which consisted of Church members. That would not have been a political move, but purely religious: for all these crimes were committed by so-called members of the Roman Catholic Church, and many of them by her clergy and in her name.[1] Cardinal Stepinac could not have been ignorant of this. Yet none of them were punished or excommunicated for these horrible crimes. If Cardinal Stepinac could not condemn them himself for some reasons of diplomacy, he could surely have asked the Pope to raise his voice against them, and to excommunicate the 'Ustashi' as he excommunicated the Communists later.

"I cannot agree with the Communists' arguments in their unjust fight against Cardinal Stepinac as a Christian Bishop. But it is difficult, at the same time, to agree with the arguments of Michael Derrick. The comparison of those more or less private letters against the crimes of the 'Ustashi' during the war, with the Pastoral Letter against Tito after it, shows quite clearly that Cardinal Stepinac himself believed there was a great difference between them. In the first case, he was acting just as a Christian diplomat: in the second, he preferred to be a martyr. His wonderful character leaves us no doubt of his sincerity in both cases. It means that he did not regard the murder by Roman Catholics of the bodies and souls of thousands of Orthodox Christians in the same light as he did similar treatment of Roman Catholics themselves. Humanly, one can understand it. But one cannot praise it as an example of Christ's spirit, or of a Christian martyr."

There is clearly room for debate on this matter, which the letter here published raises above the level of any kind of personal attack upon the Cardinal, who is a very sick man after all his sufferings. We would quote the *Eastern Churches Quarterly* article: "By this time Catholics have come to expect the authorities of the Orthodox Church to take one line in questions of Church and State and the Catholic Church to take another, though both are the outcome of Christian principles, which are often not fully appreciated by either side." This is sincerely generous language. But the question needs to be raised whether in fact we are concerned here with two divergent, but equally Christian, and no doubt ultimately reconcileable, methods, or with a more fundamental ideological difference, involving on one side or the other a real aberration from Christian principles which needs to be discovered and corrected before reconciliation is possible. We shall welcome further discussion.

Conferences—continue to multiply. We publish below as of special interest a Greek account (translated from Ἐκκλησία) of the Third World Conference of Christian Youth held at Kottayam in December; a long and constructively critical account by Fr. Vladimir Rodzianko of the Inter-

[1] See the book, *Magnum Crimen*, written by Victor Novac, an ex-Catholic, which gives documentary proof of all this.

national Conference of Orthodox Youth held at Sèvres in April; and a short account, by one of the few Anglicans who took part, of the Congress on Byzantine Studies held at Salonica, also in April. It is much to be hoped that there will be many more Anglicans at the next Byzantine Congress, at Istanbul in 1955, as the inseparability of Byzantine studies from vital matters of the Christian Faith cannot be too much stressed.

FLOOD RELIEF. Two gifts to our need should be recorded here with sincerely felt gratitude. In May the generous sum of 5,000,000 drachmae was sent by the Church of Greece to the Archbishop of Canterbury for the victims of the flood-ravaged areas, as an expression of deepest sympathy. Such generosity, from a nation rarely far above subsistence level, after twelve of the hardest years in its history, is no surprise to those who know the Greek people. Poignancy is added to the gift by the news, when these notes were already in the press, of the terrible earthquake disaster in the Ionian Islands. May the gesture be worthily requited! Not, of course, comparable in quantity, but at least equally moving, was the gift of £25 from the Russian "Action Orthodoxe" in Paris, for the use of the Church of England among poor children, sick people, and flood victims. "She of her penury—." We had been accustomed to think of this organization as concerned with care for the poorest of a very needy community. We did not expect them to give to us, and are deeply stirred by this further evidence of their Christian character. It was decided to send their gift to the St. Mary's Home for Children at Broadstairs, which is run by the Kilburn Sisters, and very much in need of money.

A NOTABLE OCCASION. On Saturday, May 9th, the Bishop of Salisbury inducted the Rev. W. H. Macartney to the Vicarage of Upavon. The service must surely have been unique, for an English country church, in the number of clergy of foreign Churches who took their place in the procession. For the Orthodox, Fr. M. Nikolič represented the Serbian Church, Fr. F. Galdau the Rumanian, Fr. A. Gramatins the Latvian, and Fr. N. Hindo the Estonian—the first two robed in stole and chasuble. The Armenian Vardapet, Fr. B. Toumayan, also took part. And there were representatives of the Swedish and Estonian Lutheran Churches, and of the Dutch, French, and Swiss Reformed Churches. Such a gathering speaks for itself of the appreciation felt for Mr. Macartney's devoted work during the past years as Assistant General Secretary of the Church of England Council on Foreign Relations, and of the affection he has won from all who have had to deal with him. We are sure that the achievement of his wish for what we certainly could not call *retirement* to a country parish will not put an end to his work in building up international Christian friendship and understanding. Our very best wishes go with him.

OBITUARY. Among those who have passed from sight since our last issue, we must first honour the memory of Cyril Douglas Horsley, Bishop of Gibraltar (and formerly of Colombo), whose death at the age of forty-nine comes as the reward of six years' indefatigable work in the diocese which spreads from the Mediterranean to the Caspian, involving special responsibilities in relations with the Orthodox Churches in that area, which

he accepted to the full. May he rest in peace—and may a worthy successor be found for him!

William Ainger Wigram was a brave old veteran who will perhaps chiefly be remembered for his constant championship of the deeply-wronged Assyrian nation, but who could also write on the "Separation of the Monophysites"—in a book which, however, hardly does justice to the Chalcedonian Orthodox. But that is not all. He was British Chaplain in Constantinople through the 1914–18 War—during which he suffered imprisonment. And from 1922–6 he was British Chaplain in Athens. He was a notable figure who will be greatly missed in our gatherings. R.I.P.

We must apologize for the tardy appearance of this double number—a series of obstacles in regard to some of our more important matter held up publication until summer holidays intervened to cause still further delay. But in any case it seems probable that we shall frequently publish in double numbers in future, as this has the great advantage of giving room for more variety within each issue, and also of enabling us to publish longer articles without having to curtail or divide them.

LONG LIVE THE QUEEN!

Impressions of the Coronation from Fr. Antony Bloom, Priest of the Russian Church in London

THOSE who take an active part in the life of our Parish know that, long before the Coronation, it had begun to prepare itself for the great event for which we were all waiting. Two lectures had been given in our Church House to describe the Russian Orthodox rite of the Coronation of the Emperor; extensive explanations had been given as to its meaning and history, and parallels drawn between the Russian Orthodox and the Anglican rite had stressed the outer analogies, and the inner identity of spirit, between the two rites.

On the Sunday before the Coronation, a special service had been held in our Church, after and in addition to the usual prayers offered at every service for "our sovereign lady Queen Elizabeth, the Royal Family, the country, its people and all who dwell therein"—a votive office was sung: all those who could leave their homes and come to Church were present: and it is from their whole heart that they presented their petitions to God that He would give to the Queen the fullness of His grace, the abundance of His gift of counsel and wisdom, of strength and charity; that He would lead her into all truth, and make her people to live in peace and concord, in worship and righteousness, during her reign, and protect her against all foes visible and invisible.

Before this service, a sermon was preached on the meaning of the service to which the Queen was about to come, and its significance for, and in the lives of, all those who are privileged to live under her God-given rule.

* * * * *

But all this was only the keeping of a vigil.

At last the long expected great day came.

I am not to tell about things that every one has seen, or could see and

hear—things already abundantly spoken of: but I shall tell of the thoughts and feelings which have found their way to the depth of my heart.

* * * * *

At the Queen's command (as the invitation issued by the Earl Marshal said) I was given the privilege of being present at the Coronation Service in Westminster Abbey, with a group of Anglican Bishops from overseas (Jerusalem, Sumatra, New Zealand . . .), and with the Metropolitan of Thyatira Athenagoras, Apocrisiarius of the Patriarch of Constantinople in Great Britain. There were no other Orthodox with us: the other clergy of our various Churches were seated in different parts of the Abbey.

I arrived early in the morning, as I had been directed, in a car with the Vicar of St. John the Baptist, Holland Road, who was driving thither a friend of his. The latter had a permit, the former a car—and I was kindly offered the benefit of both!

One could hardly recognize either the Abbey or its surroundings. A great many tribunes, an annexe to the Abbey itself, and a variety of decorations, had been built round the Abbey. Everything was colourful and glorious—both things and people—in spite of the rain. And obviously, people had come together not to "look at" a ceremony, but to take part in a great, gladdening event—to rejoice at *their own* feast.

Inside, also, the Abbey was quite new. From the floor to the roof tribunes had been built, solid and beautiful, with the arms and ciphers of Queen Elizabeth II. Later, I discovered that more than 7,000 people had found place under the vaults of the shrine of Great Britain's glory. But when I arrived, people were still few. I took the opportunity to see things which later, as I rightly expected, would not be visible for me—the Altar, covered with golden dishes, cups, patens, etc., the pride of Westminster Treasury. Shall I avow my feelings? I was disappointed by all the dishes. So much better do I love its usual sober beauty!

I was seated at the junction of the Sanctuary and the North Transept, in the East gallery of the latter, looking West. I could therefore see the Throne and its surroundings very well, and all the way to it from the West Door. So each of the processions came towards me, and their slow dignity made it easy to recognize each one.

By and by, guests began to fill up the Abbey. I do not venture to describe the colourful variety of the costumes, the vivid, spectacular beauty of the scenery, the sober intensity of every action, the joy, devout and shining, of all those to whom it was given to take part in the Feast—their own feast, and that of all the peoples of the Empire. I only feel sorry for those who were not given the privilege of experiencing it, or proved unable to see or sense it. But to those who have seen and understood, the old Abbey Church of Westminster—so often misunderstood by idle and superficial tourists—has revealed all its grandeur, all its eternal glory, and will remain dear as only a flag or an ikon can be.

Leaving aside now everything else, I shall concentrate upon a few impressions immediately connected with the person of the Queen.

* * * * *

When the Queen entered the Abbey all the rest faded away—or rather,

all its shining beauty was focussed and became meaningful. Nothing was left of the dazzling pageantry, of all the diversity. Greatness only remained. And each and all were spellbound, merged into silence deep and worshipful: not an outward silence only, but an inner sense of it.

The Queen was being brought to the Altar by two Bishops. And she walked towards her destiny merged into a deep and severe thought, with the amazing simplicity and recollection which is hers. She was going forth consciously to the Altar of the Living God, to be a living sacrifice, like the daughter of Jephthah—to die to herself, in order to live *with* and *for* her people. In the words of the Russian writer Leskov, "A life was coming to an end: a '*Vita*' was beginning." The young Queen did not prepare her heart for a feast, but for a consecration—that is, a sacrifice. How could one not respond with one's whole heart, one's whole soul, and one's whole strength, "O Lord, save the Queen: and hear us when we call upon Thee."

The Queen has brought all her youthful life, and given it up to God *for* her people. And not only God, but all, have accepted and received this gift. How carefully, worshipfully, are we to live now, to remain true to the gift of God, and the oath pledged on both sides.[1]

* * * * *

The Service begins with the Recognition of the Queen by all those who are present both in the Abbey Church and in the wide world. The Archbishop of Canterbury presents the Queen to her people and asks, "All you who are come this day to do your homage and service, are you willing to do the same?" Thus did he turn to the four quarters of the earth, and from each of them came a firm, truthful, and decided reply—"God save Queen Elizabeth." And all those who heard *how* that reply was given, without any hesitation, will witness that her people stand as a faithful, devoted bodyguard round the Queen, speaking of whom Churchill said, ". . . the Lady whom we respect because she is our Queen, and whom we love because she is herself."

After the Recognition, follow the Coronation, and the Holy Communion Service. First of all, the Queen takes the Oath that she is to rule the peoples and countries given to her by the will of God in accordance with law, justice, mercy, and freedom: that she will keep whole the Faith of her people. Of this she is to be reminded by the Holy Bible, presented to her by the Moderator of the Church of Scotland with the words, "Here is wisdom: this is the royal law: these are the lively oracles of God."

* * * * *

I will not attempt to describe the Service. All could read, see, or hear it. But I want to say a few words about the Homage. The representative of each of the orders of peers approached the Queen seated upon her throne in full regalia, surrounded by her supporters. He knelt down before her, and put his hands in hers, reading his Oath in the name of those whom he was representing, all of whom knelt at the same time, thus taking part in the action.

[1] Cf. the Queen's Address to her People—"I have in sincerity pledged myself to your service, as so many of you are pledged to mine. Throughout all my life and with all my heart I shall strive to be worthy of your trust."

The first to approach was the Duke of Edinburgh. And this, it seems to me, was a great and beautiful thing—a "mystery"—the acceptance of all that kingly service meant to her: the recognition that his wife is also his queen—a sacrifice of self as great as the Queen's; a new depth in their life; a renewal, at the greater depth of the Church of God, of the marriage vows which build the "Small Church of the Christian family."

* * * * *

While entering the Abbey Church, and during the days that followed, I watched the crowd; I looked into the faces of all whom I met; I listened to the comments made by various people—from the simplest folk up to the varied company the Archbishop of Canterbury called together at his Coronation Garden Party. Each and all were full of a true, vivid gladness, without a shadow of indifference, or of envy; a joy personal, direct, that the Lord had given to the Country and to the Empire a Queen who in her short lifetime had won the love and respect and wholehearted devotion of all. It really has been a "spiritual spring of life and joy," a time of renewal, of raising of our best hopes, of a vital and cheerful move towards the building up of a new life, the life of the Kingdom of God. And this shall be, if only we, all, unfeignedly, soberly put our hands to the plough, and, with the Queen and *for* the Queen, give up our lives into the hands of God.

RESTORATION OF THE BULGARIAN PATRIARCHATE

We print here (translated from the French) the letter received by the Archbishop of Canterbury from the newly-elected Patriarch of Bulgaria and Metropolitan of Sofia, to which the Archbishop has replied offering his congratulations:—

Holy Synod of the Bulgarian Church, No. 3697, May 23rd, 1953. Sofia.

To The Most Rev. the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury Geoffrey Francis Fisher, London.

Your Grace,

With brotherly affection in Christ, we announce to Your Grace that on May 10th, 1953, at Sofia, that city protected by the Almighty and capital of the National Bulgarian Republic, your humble servant was elected Patriarch of Bulgaria and Metropolitan of Sofia by the Church Council in conformity with the Statute of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church. On the same day in the patriarchal cathedral of St. Alexander Nevsky, the enthronization took place according to the ecclesiastical order approved by the Holy Synod with the participation in the prayers of the whole Bulgarian episcopate, of well-beloved representatives of dear and much honoured sister Churches—Russian, Georgian, Antiochene, Rumanian, Polish, Czechoslovak—of clergy devoted to the Lord and of the pious faithful people.

Other very dear sister Churches associated themselves with this great solemnity and in the deep joy of our faithful people, manifesting their sentiments in a touching manner.

The Bulgarian Orthodox Church has existed for more than eleven centuries (since A.D. 865) and during this long period of a life overwhelmed with blessings, she has attained spiritual maturity in giving birth to a large number of Saints and servants of God. Already in A.D. 927, following the order laid down, she was honoured with the dignity of a Patriarchate which was confirmed in A.D. 1235 by the Great Council of Lampsacus (on the Asiatic shore of the Dardanelles).

When Bulgaria, at the end of the 14th century, was conquered by the Turks, the independent Bulgarian Church also ceased to exist. However, her autocephaly was reinstated a long time ago and this forced the necessity for her once more to have her canonical head, so that her ancient universally recognized patriarchal dignity could be restored, as had long since been agreed by the Holy Synod and foreseen in the Statute for the Bulgarian Orthodox Church.

The election of the head of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church became a canonical and vital necessity after the resignation in September 1948 of its then head, His Beatitude the former Exarch Stephan, which was accepted by the Holy Synod. On May 10th, 1953, by the voice of the Church Council, this heavy and responsible lot became that of your humble servant, who up to the day of the election had served by the Grace of God as Bishop for 17 years, 15 of them as Metropolitan of Plovdiv and nearly 2½ as Acting President of the Holy Synod.

Following the custom adopted in relations between the Churches, We inform Your Grace by this brotherly letter of our election to the Bulgarian Patriarchal Throne and enthronization. At the same time we announce to you that we are going to continue as at present, in full accord with the Holy Synod of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church, to be fervent in the unalterable Faith of Salvation, to strive to maintain it both in its purity and activity and in the truthful preaching of the Saving Word of God.

We shall be eager to strengthen the Holy Church of God in the spirit and truth of its founder, Jesus Christ, and of the apostolate of the Holy Apostles, observing jealously the canonical estate and the pious traditions of the Holy Catholic Church. We shall take our full part with joy in the Lord in strengthening and deepening the links of love between the Churches of the different countries. As much as we can we shall work, and we shall also pray for peace, goodwill and brotherhood among the peoples.

We beg you to pray that God will bless our ministry, that it may be agreeable to him, of service to the Church and beneficial for your humble servant and for the faithful people.

We remain, Your Grace, with all our love in our Lord,

Your humble brother and fellow officiant

CYRIL

Patriarch of Bulgaria.

—The Patriarchal status thus resumed by the Bulgarian Church is very much older in its origins than that of the other Slav Churches—its recognition dating from A.D. 927, while that of the Serbian Patriarchate dates

only from 1346, and that of the Russian from 1592. Nor should we forget that it was in Bulgaria that the disciples of SS. Cyril and Methodius, expelled from Moravia, completed the work of translation of Scriptures and Liturgy, with the result that the language in liturgical use throughout the Slav Orthodox world is really Old Bulgarian. But the Serbian Patriarchate lapsed only from 1766 to 1920. And in Russia, from 1700 to 1917, the office of Patriarch was suppressed, but not the Patriarchal status of the Church. In the list of Bulgarian Patriarchs, the name of the newly-elected Cyril immediately succeeds that of Euthymius, who was expelled in 1393. And the Patriarchate had also been suppressed between 1018 and 1235. The vicissitudes of Bulgarian desire for full independence bring before us very clearly that tension between Orthodox hallowing of nationalism and Orthodox Romaic supernationalism, which has ever been one of the most creative, if also one of the most disturbing, factors in Eastern Church history.

From 1393 to 1767, a certain measure of autonomy under Constantinople was allowed to the Archbishops of Ochrida. But even this was at last suppressed. And Ochrida itself has, of course, long been far outside actual Bulgarian territory—though momentarily reannexed thereto during the last war. With the resurgence of the Balkan peoples during the 19th century, Bulgarian aspirations for an independent Church revived. And in 1870 a firman was obtained from the Sultan for the establishment of an Exarchate. But Bulgarian insistence that this Exarchate should have jurisdiction over all Bulgarians in Europe, independently of territorial boundaries, led to a breakdown of negotiations with the Ecumenical Patriarchate, and a schism which was only healed in 1945. Actually, the Exarch was resident in Turkey until 1913. And on the death of its second holder in 1915, the office was left vacant, owing to various circumstances, until the end of the last war, when steps were taken, under Russian auspices, to reorganize the Bulgarian Church, and the Metropolitan Stefan of Sofia was elected Exarch. His resignation was secured in 1948. And two years later an elaborate Church Statute was passed providing for the election of a Patriarch. The Council prescribed in the Statute was convened on May 8th, 1953, and the Metropolitan Cyril of Plovdiv was duly elected by an overwhelming majority (104 out of the 107 electors). So Bulgarian aspirations approach to their fulfilment.

We say approach. For their full achievement can only come with the recognition of the Patriarchate by Constantinople and all other Orthodox Churches. And the one-sided action of the Bulgarian Council in failing to consult them—and Constantinople in particular—before proclaiming the Patriarchate, has put an obstacle in the way of such recognition. It is to be noted that, while all the autocephalous Churches in the Soviet sphere (with the noticeable exception of the Albanian Church) were represented at the Council, of the Churches outside that sphere Antioch alone was represented—and that, in the end, only by the Antiochene apocrisiarius in Moscow, Archimandrite Basil Samaha. Other Churches (Alexandria, Jerusalem, Serbia) replied with a certain guardedness to the invitations. And the Ecumenical Patriarch and the Archbishop of Athens have refused

recognition to the restored Patriarchate. The attitude of the Ecumenical Patriarch has been set out in an Encyclical [1] in which the Patriarch states that with the termination of the schism in February, 1945, the Bulgarian Church had autocephaly, but a nominal subordination to the throne of Constantinople remained. "The Ecumenical Throne is astonished at the unilateral action of the Bulgarian Church, which is introducing innovations, and, with complete contempt for the authority of her mother Church, departing from Church order, and from the agreement signed in 1945. It would have been fitting for the Bulgarian Church to demonstrate in action its zeal and standing in Church life, and only then to ask from the Ecumenical Throne elevation to the Patriarchal dignity, with the agreement of the other heads of the autocephalous Orthodox Churches." The Encyclical concludes, however, on the note that the restoration of the Patriarchate, lost in 1393 as a result of the destruction of the Bulgarian State, would be "a natural solution of the Bulgarian question." So the door is not closed. And it is to be remembered that the Rumanian Church, with no ancient history of a Patriarchate on which to base its claim, assumed Patriarchal status by unilateral action in 1925, and yet the Ecumenical Patriarch, though not without some protestation, recognized the new Patriarch before the end of the year. And the first creation of the Bulgarian Patriarchate also might be claimed as a kind of precedent. The Tsar Simeon had assumed Patriarchal status for his Church, and the imperial title for himself, without Constantinople's authority, some years before both were given, on his death in A.D. 927, the requisite recognition from the City.

The new Patriarch's record and personality arouse our interest. Born early in 1901, he had his early theological training in Sofia and Belgrade, returning in 1922 to Sofia to teach in the newly opened theological faculty there. He became a monk towards the end of 1923, then went for two years to continue his theological education at Cernauti. On his return to Bulgaria in 1926, we find him as secretary of the Rila monastery, but he went back to Cernauti the next year to take a doctorate, then spent two years (1928–9) specializing in Philosophy at Zagreb, Vienna, and Berlin. Ordained Priest early in 1930, he became Protosyncellus of the Metropolitan of Sofia in 1931, Archimandrite and head of the cultural and educational section of the Holy Synod early in 1932, Secretary of the Holy Synod in 1935; was consecrated Bishop in July, 1936, and became Metropolitan of Plovdiv in 1938. Since January, 1951, he has been Acting President of the Holy Synod—the third holder of that office since the resignation of the Exarch Stefan in 1948.

The Council which elected him to the Patriarchate was occupied also with the election of a Supreme Church Council, and with amendments to the present Constitution of the Church. There is much here which deserves our attention, and it is hoped to publish fuller accounts in a subsequent issue. D.J.C.

[1] Published in *Tserkovni Vestnik* (June–July, 1953)—the organ of the Russian Church in Paris of the Constantinople jurisdiction.

CHURCH AND STATE IN YUGOSLAVIA

(From a Correspondent)

The Law to regulate the legal position of religious bodies. (Duplicated text with comment)

Yugoslavia: the Church and the State (92 pages)

BOTH these documents are issued by the Yugoslav Embassy in London, and the text of the Law is printed here. It will be observed that the provisions of this law are not very specific or clearly defined and their actual application is obscure. Many questions are left unanswered, and it is doubtful how far such a law as this will be a protection for the Church against the State.

The present position in Yugoslavia is notable for the considerable powers wielded by the authorities of the various constituent Yugoslav Republics. This has been a feature of Tito's policy since the earliest days, and this present law clearly leaves the decision about details to the authorities in each locality.

The result of this state of affairs is that the treatment of the Church varies very much from place to place according to the attitude of the local Communist officials. In Montenegro, for example, the Orthodox Church has a particularly difficult time. The Central Government may therefore claim to have the most blameless intentions towards the Church without much affecting the local situation except perhaps in Belgrade.

Some of the provisions of the law are not clear. For example, it is not plain from sections 12 and 13 whether priests are to be permitted by law to go to the houses of their parishioners for the celebration of slavas, and it looks as if they will not be allowed to conduct classes of instruction in private houses. If such restrictions are indeed to be imposed they would rightly be regarded as unwarrantable and oppressive interferences with religious liberties.

There is no doubt from the present actions of the Communist authorities in Yugoslavia that official policy is to use the educational system in order to implant materialism in the young and in order to root out Christianity. It will be observed that there is nothing in the law to defend Christian children against being brought up as little atheists in the schools. It is therefore extremely disingenuous of the Yugoslav Embassy in its comment to pretend to the public that the attitude of its Government is the same as that of the Government of France, where private schools may be freely built and staffed by religious bodies.

The printed pamphlet "Yugoslavia: the Church and the State," which runs to 92 pages, contains a review of the relations between Church and State over a number of years, both before and after World War II. It is unfortunately necessary to admit that the strictures which are applied to Archbishop Stepinac have ample justification, and that the account given of the matter by the Yugoslav Government is substantially accurate. One must recognize that on this subject the views of the Orthodox in Yugoslavia correspond in the main with the views of the Communist Government, and are based on personal experience.

Other parts of the account of events since the war are, however, open to objection. It is somewhat misleading for the author to try to make out that the Priests' Associations are spontaneous expressions of the desire of clergymen to associate with one another. It is well known that these bodies are sponsored by the Communist Government and are run by pro-government priests, apparently for the purpose of undermining the authority of the hierarchy of the Church. Indeed one may discover on page 66 of the pamphlet an indiscretion admitting this, the Vatican's opposition to the Priests' Associations being put down to its general opposition to everything the State does.

The pamphlet quotes the statement of the Serb Patriarch in reply to the Archbishop of Canterbury's statement of December 1952. There is good reason to suppose that the Archbishop's remarks were widely welcomed among Serb Orthodox both inside and outside Yugoslavia.

The Yugoslav Government is very anxious to try to persuade Western Christians that it takes a neutral attitude to religion, neither "for" nor "against." This is not true, and is no more than a dish for Western palates. The relaxations which have taken place have been on the surface. The power of the State is directed to rooting out religion wherever possible, to decreasing its influence and to preventing the young from learning anything but Communist materialism and atheism.

THE LAW TO REGULATE THE LEGAL POSITION OF RELIGIOUS BODIES

General Provisions

Section 1. Citizens of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia are guaranteed freedom of conscience and freedom of profession of religion.

Citizens of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia may profess any religious belief or belong to whatever religious body they wish, or profess no religion nor belong to any religious body.

The profession of a faith is the private concern of citizens.

Section 2. Citizens are free to found religious bodies.

All creeds enjoy equal rights and all religious bodies are equal before the law.

The activities of religious bodies must be in accord with the Constitution and the law.

Section 3. Religious bodies are free to conduct their church affairs and their religious rites.

Religious bodies may publish and disseminate religious publications, such publications being governed by the general regulations regarding publications.

Section 4. Education is separated from the church. There is freedom to impart religious instruction in churches, temples or any other premises appointed for this purpose.

Religious bodies are free to found special religious schools (lower secondary, secondary and higher schools) for the training of priests and may administer such schools.

Section 5. The misuse of religious affairs, religious instruction, religious publications, religious rites or any other manifestation of religious sentiments for political purposes is prohibited.

The incitement or exacerbation of religious intolerance, hatred or dissension is prohibited.

Any prohibition of or obstruction to religious assemblies, religious instruction, religious rites or of any other manifestation of religious sentiments is prohibited.

Section 6. Nobody may in any manner whatsoever be compelled to become a member of any religious body, to remain in any such body, or to leave any such body.

Nobody may in any manner whatsoever be compelled to take part in religious rites, processions or any other manifestation of religious sentiments.

Nobody may prohibit citizens from taking part in religious rites or any other manifestations of religious sentiments.

Nobody may compel any member of a religious body not to take advantage of the rights he possesses as a citizen under the Constitution and the laws.

Section 7. The rights of citizens under the Constitution and the Laws may not be limited on account of their religious convictions, on account of their belonging to any religious creed or any religious body, or on account of their taking part in the carrying out of religious rites or any other manifestation of religious sentiments.

Religious bodies, their priests, religious representatives or members of any profession of faith enjoy no preference, privilege or special protection.

Membership of any creed or the profession of any faith frees no person from those general civic, military or other duties which the law imposes on citizens.

Section 8. Religious bodies and their administrative units are legal entities in civil jurisprudence.

Section 9. The priests of the various creeds have the right to form their own associations.

Such associations of priests shall be subject to the general regulations regarding public associations.

Section 10. The decisions of religious bodies regarding matrimonial disputes or in matters of a disciplinary nature, or any other decisions of religious bodies, are void outside the religious body making them.

Section 11. The Federal Executive Council or the Executive Council of any Republic may give religious bodies material aid. The decision by which such aid is allocated may include provisions that the aid so granted shall be used in whole or in part for a specific purpose or purposes.

Religious bodies dispose of any allocated material resources independently, though where such aid is granted for a specific purpose, the religious body in question may be required to account for the use made of it.

Section 12. No person may be compelled to contribute to any religious purpose or prevented from so doing.

The collection of contributions for religious purposes is allowed in churches, temples and other appointed premises. Outside such premises contributions may be collected only with the permission of the People's Committee of the district or town.

Priests may receive emoluments for their performance of religious rites on the request of individuals, either in money or in some other customary manner, and regardless of whether the rite is performed in a church or temple, in the home of the believers or in any other place where such a rite is customarily performed.

THE PERFORMANCE OF RELIGIOUS RITES

Section 13. Religious rites, held in assemblies, may be freely performed in churches, temples or other public premises appointed by a religious body for the performance of such rites, as well as in courtyards, at lych-gates, in cemeteries or in any other public premises connected with a church or temple.

The holding of processions and other such religious rites outside premises listed in the preceding section may be permitted by the People's Committee of a district or town on the basis of regulations determined by the Executive Council of a Republic.

The provisions of the above paragraph do not apply to religious celebrations of family festivals, marriages or burials.

The competent People's Committee of a district or a town, as part of general

measures undertaken for the protection of public health and public order, may prohibit the holding of religious gatherings whilst the conditions giving rise to the measures exist.

Section 14. The act of christening and the act of circumcision of minors may be performed only on the demand of both parents of the child, or of its guardian. If the minor is over 10 years of age, his or her consent shall also be required.

Section 15. A wedding according to religious rites may be performed only after conclusion of marriage before the competent state representative and a christening only after the birth has been registered.

Section 16. Persons in hospitals, homes for the aged, hostels and similar institutions may within the limitations of the domestic rules of the institution, profess their faith, and be visited by a priest if they so desire.

Section 17. Bells on churches and temples and church buildings may be rung at times of general danger (fire, flood and so forth). The religious representative who administers the church building may not refuse the use of bells in such circumstances.

THE GIVING OF RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION

Section 18. Religious bodies themselves administer schools for training priests, freely draw up the programme and scheme of instruction and freely appoint teachers.

The State only maintains general supervision of the work of religious schools.

Section 19. Pupils of the regular educational establishments may not attend religious instruction in school hours. For attendance at religious instruction the approval of both parents or of the guardian and the consent of the minor concerned are necessary.

Schools for the training of priests may be attended only by persons who have completed their obligatory basic education.

Section 20. Persons attending schools for training of priests can enjoy those rights which are recognized to other students.

More immediate regulations concerning the enjoyment of these rights will be issued by the Federal Executive Council.

CONCLUDING PROVISIONS

Section 21. Any person infringing the provisions of this Law, provided such infringement is not otherwise a criminal act, shall be liable to a fine of up to 10,000 dinars or of up to fifteen days imprisonment.

Section 22. If by misuse of religious instruction a criminal act is committed, the court may, in addition to the sanctions provided by the Law, also close the religious school for a period of from one to ten years.

Section 23. The Federal Executive Council or otherwise the Executive Council of any Republic shall have charge of the administration of this Law and where necessary prescribe more detailed provisions for this purpose.

Section 24. This Law comes into force one week after publication in the Official Gazette of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia.[2]

THE ORTHODOX AND THE THIRD WORLD CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIAN YOUTH

(The following account of the Conference was published in *Ekklesia*, Feb. 1st, 1953, from the Archimandrite Panteleimon Karanikolas, of the Church of Greece, an Orthodox member of the Conference.)

THE Third World Conference of Christian Youth was held in the city of Kottayam in Travancore in Southern India from the 11th to the 25th of last December.

[2] The Law was published in the Official Gazette of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia No. 22, May 27th, 1953.

Since the First and Second Conferences had met in Europe, at Amsterdam in 1939, and at Oslo in 1947, it was decided that the Third should be called in Asia.

India was preferred as the place of assembly, first because this would give moral encouragement to the Christian minority there, which scarcely reaches the number of 9 million in a total population of 427 million inhabitants; secondly, because the Syrian-Orthodox Churches were celebrating the 19th Centenary of the visit of the Apostle Thomas to that part of India; thirdly, because Travancore is famous throughout the world for its incomparable natural beauties; and finally, because, in view of the many colleges in this province, it would not be difficult to find accommodation for the 3,000 and more representatives of the fifty and more countries represented at the Conference.

The Conference met under the aegis of the following organizations: the World Student Christian Federation, the World Council for Christian Education, the World's Alliance of Y.M.C.A.s, and the World Council of Churches.

The general character of the Conference was mutual understanding between the representatives, and mutual respect, within the Christian spirit and civilization.

The aim of the Conference was the gathering together of representatives of Christian youth from all the world for the practical demonstration by each one of the indwelling of Christ in his heart, and for the common discussion, on the basis of Christ and His Gospel, of the great contemporary problems which are occupying Christians and all mankind.

The five subjects which occupied the Conference are the following:—

1. *How shall we teach Christ and His Gospel to those of other religions, to the intellectuals without religion, to the Marxists, and to the indifferent?* The conclusion was, in a few words, that we should preach the Gospel to all fervently and without ceasing, by our life and by our words, in the manner best adapted to the differing circumstances.

This preaching of the Gospel of Christ should be done with zeal, with much love, and with effort to understand the life of those to whom the preaching is directed.

In this ministry, it should be no matter if one is thought "foolish" or suspect, given that the preaching of Christ is, for the indifferent and the unbelieving, "foolishness," while for every one, and for the unbelievers themselves, when they believe, it is changed into the "power of God" and the "wisdom of God."

Likewise in regard to Christians, work is needed for mutual understanding between them and between the Christian Churches, and for restoration of the Christian community to the spiritual level of virtue of the Christians of New Testament times.

2. *The Christian teaching in relation to the present-day search for social justice and personal freedom.* The conclusion of the discussions was that all things in man are imperfect, and that he who denies his dependence on God is not free at all.

Human freedom is understood as that which results from man's serving the purpose and plan of God.

The fundamental error of communism is that it bases freedom outside the purpose of God, and limits all things to man and the present life.

Communism puts freedom in danger: and the reply of Christianity to communism is the opposition of the former to the latter not only on the ground of purely economic systems and beliefs, but also by the study of communism, and more especially of its ideas about man; by profound study of the Christian religion; by the setting of Christian love against communistic hatred; and by the effort of Christians, individually and corporately, to champion the poor and the suffering, and to make their influence felt for the solution of social problems.

3. *The Church as witness of Jesus Christ.* What was achieved here, and afterwards incidentally in the discussions about the nature of the Church, was the formulation about the Gospel that this is the Good News about what God did by His intervention in History, by the sending of His Son to live as a man, to die on the Cross, and to save man; as also no less by the founding of the Church after His Resurrection to continue His work.

4. *The demands of Christ in our personal and family relationships.* In the discussions on this point we touched on the problems of human misery resulting from divers factors, including war; and the necessity of help on the part of Christians for the radical or partial healing of this misery.

Likewise we discussed the problems of the present-day family, and the two extremes—first, the unbridled liberty observed in the West; second, the tradition still in force in the East, where only the decision of the parents is of force in the case of the marriage of their children: and it was agreed that both these extremes, and especially the first, led to the present-day loosening of family ties, the dangers of which the Christian youth of to-day is called to face in the light and power of the Gospel.

5. *Christ and His teaching in the present-day world of international tension.* On this subject, there was no disagreement in regard to the view that there is no difference in the face of Christ between coloured and white men and races. As to the question of war, likewise, there was agreement that the Christian ought always, both individually and corporately, as also when he disposes of power and influence, to work in such a way that war may, if possible, be averted, and peaceful solutions found for the various problems.

In regard to the participation or otherwise of the Christian in war, the majority of the Asiatics, and of the coloured races generally—except those who had had personal experience of communism—and almost all the representatives of Latin America, ranged themselves with the pacifist view, while on the other hand the English-speaking delegates, and we Europeans, held the view that in the case of war the Christian has not to choose between good and evil but, unfortunately, between two evils; when he can, and must, choose what is not the worse.

Finally all agreed that on the issue of the Christian's partaking or not partaking in war, he ought to choose the lesser of two evils.

Apart from the discussions on these five subjects, through the whole length of the Conference, the representatives were split up into groups for study of the New Testament: and we discussed it, crystallizing our thoughts

as to the right way of study of it and of Holy Scripture in general—that such study should not be dry and formal, but oiled and based upon a fervent inner disposition and a rich religious consciousness.

Likewise, when we have to teach it, we should first create the above conditions for the others also. In regard to the manner of teaching, it was judged that this generally can vary from theoretical teaching to visual means.

We Orthodox representatives at the Conference were few—three from Greece, one from Constantinople, one from the Russian Diaspora, and two from the region of Antioch—the one from Lebanon, the other from Syria.

The fact was also noticeable that the Roman Catholics were at last showing an interest in the Ecumenical Movement. Thus at this Conference, for a concrete example, on December 20th, the day of the celebration of the 19th Centenary of the visit of the Apostle Thomas to India, three Roman Catholic Bishops took part in the festivities, and sat with the Bishops and clergy of all the other Churches and confessions, and one of them was included among the speakers of the day, and spoke to the representatives and the rest of the people assembled, which exceeded 30,000, at Kottayam.

We Orthodox representatives had the opportunity to follow discourses delivered specially for the representatives by learned professors like the German Professor Niemöller. Likewise we had the opportunity to speak both in the group meetings and in the full meetings of the Conference. We were listened to by all with great attention, and it was said by many of the Protestants that the Orthodox Church enjoys a great respect from them all, since it has not a past of a kind that should irritate separated Christians, nor a totalitarian organization, while on the other hand it has a rich and impressive ritual, an exceptional and well-conceived conservatism, as also the coherence and the Faith of the One and undivided Church, elements of which have been lost by most of the Protestant Churches—and they are conscious of this defect.

We had the possibility, in the conduct of the meetings, of formulating our opinions, and influencing the taking of decisions and the formulation of findings.

Our conservatism, on another side, gave the occasion for the examination and re-examination of the various questions, and likewise gave occasion to the representatives of the Protestant churches to think very seriously about the existence and life of the Orthodox Church, which constitutes one of the three principal groups of the Christian world, and on the one hand holds elements which cannot be slandered as Roman Catholic, while on the other hand it disagrees radically with the greater part of Protestant teaching, and believes, finally, that it possesses in itself all the prerequisites and marks of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.

In private conversations, we had the opportunity to reply to questions and doubts of many of the representatives, and to speak to them about the texture, the life, the faith, and the organization of our Church, and about very many other things.

Many expressed their amazement at what they heard, since what they

knew about the Orthodox Church had come from Roman Catholic sources.

The result of all this was, first, the expression in full conference by the mouth of David Wilcox of an exhortation that all the Protestants should try to get to know the Orthodox Church better, since it has very many things to teach them; and secondly, the desire expressed by the representatives to the Council of the Youth Section of the World Council of Churches, that there should be organized in the near future a Conference in which half the number of the representatives should be Orthodox, so that opportunity might be provided, by intercourse with them and by discussions in the meetings, for the Orthodox Church to be known at closer quarters by the Protestants.

The general title of the Conference, set from the beginning, was "Christ is the Answer"; because Christians from the ends of the world were going to discuss on subjects and problems with the Christian teaching for their criterion.

The Conference ended with the same slogan, and with the fuller understanding of it—that always, and in proportion to our virtue, and our penetration by study and experience into His divine Will, He is for all questions the only and final Answer.

Archimandrite PANTELEIMON KARANIKOLAS

THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF ORTHODOX YOUTH

APRIL 7TH–12TH, 1953

ON Easter Tuesday, the very day of the Annunciation, a momentous Conference of Orthodox Youth was opened in the small Paris suburb of Sévres—truly momentous because of the magnitude of the tasks which it was facing for the first time in the history of the Orthodox Church; tasks the fulfilment of which would indeed be epoch-making.

The first cause for rejoicing was in the actual composition of the conference. There were representatives, though not always official, of almost all local Orthodox Churches, and of the different nationalities entering thereinto. The second cause for rejoicing was the peaceful participation in the work of the conference of delegates belonging to the same nationality, but to different and usually hostile jurisdictions. There was the overwhelming sense of true Orthodox universality—of our all belonging to the One True Church.

There were present representatives of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, and of the Patriarchates of Antioch, Moscow, and Serbia, and of autocephalous and autonomous Churches—the Greek; the Finnish; the Russians-in-exile; the Russian Exarchate in Western Europe of the Ecumenical Patriarchate; the Rumanians-in-exile; the Georgians in France; French of the Western rite; and German and English Orthodox belonging to various jurisdictions. Representatives of the Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches were present as guests; among them the well-known Dominican theologian, Fr. Dumont; Mr. R. Strong representing the Y.M.C.A., and the Rev. B. T. Molander and Mr. Ph. Maury from the World Council of Churches in Geneva.

The Conference was centred round prayer. And it was due to this that seemingly insuperable difficulties were miraculously overcome.

The first Liturgy (Wednesday, April 8th) was celebrated in French by a Georgian Priest from Paris, Fr. Elias Melia. The choir also sang in French: and it was thus possible for all nationalities to be united in the service.

The difficulties facing us when we started our work were so great that at times the whole conference seemed non-existent. The two problems, of nationalism and of jurisdiction, left to us by the previous generation, were like horrible festering wounds. To ignore them was impossible: to touch upon them would cause pain, and perhaps ruin our work. But before we had decided upon a course of action, the questions arose before us in a practical way. One of the national committees in Paris, the Serbian, which has no internal divisions, and is canonically under its own Patriarch, refused to send delegates to the conference on the ground that the organizers of the Conference took an unfriendly view of their Church. The attitude of the Paris Serbs was upheld by others, such as the Rumanians: and it seemed that the Conference was going to end before it had begun.

The Greek delegates kept emphasizing their caution and unwillingness to compromise themselves in the eyes of their brothers in Greece by the creation of an "Orthodox Centre" in Paris (which of course we were not doing): and the different Russian groups each reflected the attitude of its own jurisdiction towards the hierarchy, the Ecumenical Movement, and the solution of national and territorial questions.

One might well have despaired.

But the Spirit breathes where it lists. Peaceful co-operation in the Holy Spirit prevailed. Among the young people at the Conference the urge to unity and canonicity, to membership of the One True Church in the face of an unbelieving world, to the victory of Orthodoxy, was so strong that the miracle happened.

In response to the call of their Serbian brothers in Germany and England, the Serbian delegates from Paris came to the Conference, after one of its organizers with truly Christian humility had publicly underlined his friendly attitude towards them. They not only came, with the other dissenting groups, but joined in the work of the Conference with sincere enthusiasm, showing how much they were in sympathy with the main idea.

After this incident particularly, there is no doubt that all delegates were agreed that this main idea is infinitely dear to us. And that was everything: the success of the Conference and of the work that would follow it depended upon this. By this inner agreement, by this truly Orthodox faith in One Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, the Spirit of God vanquished the evil one.

Liturgical communion was achieved, and this turned out to be the most important thing. As a result of the presence of Priests of different Churches which were in canonical communion with both, even those who might have appeared to be out of communion with each other were able to be included —as has happened more than once in the history of the Orthodox Church.

On Thursday the Divine Liturgy was celebrated in Slavonic (Russian and Serbian style) and Finnish; on Friday in German and Arabic; on

Saturday in Greek, English and French. Thursday evening Vespers was a full episcopal service (with Bishop Cassian of Catania), conducted in Greek and Slavonic. Priests of different jurisdictions celebrated together, and at the last solemn Liturgy, held at the Theological Academy in Paris, every one received Communion, irrespective of jurisdiction or opinions held. Here indeed was the greatest victory there could have been.

Lit up by the rays of this Divine Light, the problems before the conference appeared less formidable than they would otherwise have done:—

1. The formation of an organization to unite Orthodox youth all over the world:
2. Our attitude to the Hierarchy:
3. Our attitude to the Ecumenical Movement:
4. National and Territorial boundaries:
5. Methods of Church work among Orthodox young people:
6. The missionary tasks of Orthodoxy:
7. The layman's task:
8. The Catholicity of the Church:
9. Orthodoxy in the present day.

Some of these questions arose according to plan, others spontaneously.

The programme included several papers:—

(a) J. F. Meyendorff (Lecturer at the Theological Academy in Paris) on "The Catholicity of the Church."
(b) Fr. Vasily Zenkovsky on "Sins and Shortcomings."
(c) P. A. Evdokimov on "The Layman's Responsibility."
(d) L. A. Zander on "Orthodoxy and Ecumenicism."
(e) Octavian Vuia (the Rumanian representative) on the same subject.
(f) Fr. P. Zacharias (German Orthodox Priest) on "The Catholicity of the Church in Orthodox Liturgical Life."

Discussions followed these papers both at the plenary sessions and in study groups: they were lively, and undoubtedly fruitful.

The lecturers' task was to answer the pressing questions of ecclesiology—i.e., the Orthodox teaching about the Church: for without the theoretical answers, it was impossible to make any progress in practical matters. From the choice both of themes and of lecturers it was obvious that there would be a large measure of theological agreement in the answers to these questions. This produced both good and bad results. The outlook presented to the audience was well thought out: but its one-sidedness inevitably produced an immediate reaction in the people who took a different view. This made the discussions more lively, and was a distinct advantage, since there was fundamental agreement about the main idea—Orthodox Unity.

J. F. Meyendorff in his exhaustive survey showed the essential Catholicity of the Church as unity and indivisibility. Any one familiar with his writings, and with those of Fr. Alexander Schmemann and other representatives of that school, would see that his talk was an exposition of his main contention that the Church as the integral Body of Christ is present in all its fullness wherever it happens to be. From this followed the conclusion that the territorial principle was essential to Orthodoxy, and that diverse nationalities and authorities cannot affect this principle. This conclusion was not

explicitly stated in the lecture, but was made abundantly clear in the discussion.

One cannot but agree with the principle of fullness and wholeness in the Church, and its territorial corollary. But in any one-sided enthusiasm for a certain truth there is danger of error. And so in this case, one may overlook the human element in the Church if one gives too much attention to the divine. In the opinion of J. F. Meyendorff, as in the rest of the Paris school, one feels the danger of "ecclesiological monophysitism"—a peculiar idealism which does not or will not see the contemporary human problems of the Church as they really are. Since this mystical approach combined with an enthusiasm for history presents a Church very far removed from reality, the second lecturer's conclusions were no surprise: his task was to show this reality, which is in fact a Church full of sin. Nor was it surprising that one of the Greek delegates hotly opposed such a conception of Catholicity, insisting on philological grounds that the word meant not "wholeness in a particular place," but a practical agreement of the parts with the whole—i.e., of each individual Church-member, parish, diocese, or patriarchate, with all the rest, with the Church as a whole. In this discussion an old argument was reopened which filled the pages of the Parisian church press some years ago, the chief protagonists being Fr. A. Schmemann on the one side, and Fr. Sophrony on the other. Both held somewhat extreme views: but it seems to me that the truth lies in a combination of the two.

Fr. Vasily Zenkovsky's paper was convincing both in form and content, but it still left one wondering how the holy and spotless Bride of the Lamb could be full of sin. One of the English delegates correctly remarked that we should change a preposition, and speak of the sins *in* the Church, not the sins *of* the Church. Perhaps Fr. Vasily meant to say precisely that: and in the discussion he did come to it. But there was good reason for his audience to be perplexed. When you are shown on the one hand an ideal divorced from reality, and on the other the sad facts, your only alternatives seem to be either to say that the Church does not exist at all, or that it has sinned in its entirety.

P. A. Evdokimov's paper also left one dubious. He showed most beautifully what the layman's ideal role in the Church should be, basing it strictly on Holy Scripture and liturgical practice in the Orthodox Church. But that vision seemed cut off from the integral conception of the Church, particularly in relation to the Hierarchy and practical life. In idealizing the Church's catholicity, Evdokimov like Meyendorff kept insisting on the "general priesthood of the laity." Although he did not deny the principle of hierarchy, and the sacrament of Orders, as such, he did not even mention the latter. This made the paper incomplete and obscure. And whenever one's thoughts descended from the heights of the lecturer's ideal to practical life, one was once again faced with the choice between saying either that the ideal was unattainable, or that the Church as such had sinned, and should be "reformed in an Orthodox manner."

The logical conclusion of this series of papers was Professor L. A. Zander's talk on "Orthodoxy and Ecumenism." Ecumenism is the only

way out for Orthodoxy, which finds itself in it, and obtains deliverance so from all its internal troubles: Ecumenism as true Orthodox universality is the embodiment of the Catholic Church on earth, provided the confessional basis is strictly observed: that this is so is confirmed both by actual life and by the canonical decisions of Orthodox hierarchs: any one who is against Ecumenism is against Orthodoxy itself. That was Prof. Zander's main theme. But here too the audience was left perplexed. This time the ideal was depicted on a world-wide scale: but again there was the tragic disparity between it and real life. Either one had to believe with the whole force of the Russian spirit, with its insistence on all or nothing, in the all-conquering movement of Christian Ecumenism, or to say "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die."

This is the outline of the papers. I may have presented them in too simplified a form and too subjectively: but that was my personal reaction. Of course there was not, and could not have been, a "plot" among the lecturers, as some people supposed. They disagreed with each other on many points, and each honestly put forward what he believed. But they all belonged not only to one nationality with its particular characteristics, but to one group within it, in jurisdiction and in theological ideas. They probably were not aware that, looked at from outside, they appeared as a group. In practice they denied their own main idea, that the fullness of the Church is present in any part of it. They found it necessary to take into account what others had to contribute. Here was the justification of Ecumenism; but only of an Orthodox Ecumenism, inspired by common participation in the Liturgy, one Faith and one Truth.

The paper read by Fr. Octavian Vuia went, as he himself warned us, beyond the limits of pure theology, and described a peculiar existentialist philosophy; while Fr. P. Zacharias's paper was highly specialized and dealt with the historical aspect of the Orthodox Liturgy. For this reason neither of these papers was reflected in the discussions.

There is no room here to report everything that was said: I can only summarize first the general conclusions, and then those on particular subjects.

The chief thing that became clear at the Conference was that in the interpretation of the Church there was a lack of balance between the human and divine elements. When the balance is preserved, the ideal becomes real and the real ideal. Grace is divine, and its vessels weak: but the strength of God is manifested in weakness. Unity and holiness are divine attributes: catholicity and apostolicity, human. The divine has no need of catholicity, which is a relationship with the whole. The very existence of this term shows the imperfections of the human element, which needs the union of the parts with the whole. One would not say of the Angelic Church that it is "catholic," because it *is* unity. But in contrast, only that man is a true Christian (in the full sense of the word) who is a Catholic—i.e., a member of the Church in word and deed. Apostolicity—i.e., the hierarchy with canonical succession—is the outward sign of this deed. In this human part of the Church there are, and are bound to be, sins (until the wheat is sifted from the tares): but there is always a sign of

the link with the divine holiness (the Sacraments) and unity (Love). "Schism" of whatever kind and "the Church" are incompatible conceptions.

A great merit of this Conference was that this idea became clear to all, and with that, problems which were insoluble became soluble.

To turn to these problems, listed earlier:—

1. *The Creation of an organization to bind together Orthodox Youth all over the world.* A special group of delegates devoted its energies to working out this problem. It consisted of representatives of all Churches and all nationalities; and it was agreed from the beginning that the Conference could not break up without forming some kind of permanent link which would continue the work here begun. The desire for the unity of all Orthodox youth (who represent the future of the Church) was so strong that it triumphed over all disagreements. These, however, appeared from the beginning. Some considered that a *Centre* was necessary, in the full sense of the term; while others were afraid of centralization, and suggested a federation. After night-long discussions, the suggestion of the Greek delegates was accepted that the name of the new organization should be the Greek New Testament word "*Syndesmos*" (= *bond*, Eph. iv. 3, Col. ii. 19, iii. 14): thus both Vatican centralization and Protestant federation would be avoided.

The Serbian delegation worked out the terms of association, and provided each delegate with a copy in French, which served as a basis for subsequent discussion. The final text was to be submitted at a Plenary Session. This was where the greatest difficulties began. A Greek delegate immediately said that the "Syndesmos" should be limited to Western Europe, because if it was "universal" in character it might cause misgivings in the Greek and other Orthodox Churches. To this objection many delegates (including the Russian) answered that the whole point was the gradual, if not immediate, uniting of all, and that geographical limitations would bring nothing but harm. The Finnish and Serbian delegations, who always spoke in the same strain, having previously agreed among themselves, said that though Finland and Yugoslavia were not in Western Europe, they had no intention of cutting themselves off from their countries and mother-Churches. In Finland there exists an organization of Orthodox Youth which is successfully developing under the leadership of the hierarchy; and it wants to take part in "Syndesmos" too: in Western Europe, on the other hand, there is only one Orthodox Finn, a student at the Theological Academy in Paris; and he will have to return to Finland. In Yugoslavia, no Youth Organizations on a religious footing are allowed by the Government: but young Orthodox are to be found in the Theological Faculty of the University, in the Seminaries, etc.: and they could be afforded much help and support by "Syndesmos" if it was not limited to Western Europe; particularly as all the Serbs living abroad as Churchmen support their Patriarch.

Still, greater disagreements arose over the question of the actual organization. Whom were the members of "Syndesmos" to represent? Some said, Churches: others, nationalities: a third group, youth organizations:

and a fourth stood for personal membership. The Serbian and Finnish delegations, who had come to the Conference with the blessing of their Bishops, kept insisting on hierarchical and canonical correctness. The Russians of the Constantinople Exarchate, who mostly represented youth organizations, wanted to keep that form of representation: while the Rumanians from Germany, who have neither their own Church nor organization, stood for representation by nationality. The remaining delegates joined one or other of these parties.

Eventually the following was agreed:—Syndesmos is not limited geographically, but is not yet called "world-wide"—that will depend on the Churches which take part in it. There will be represented in it Churches, according to their jurisdiction; the existing youth organizations (if they receive the blessing of a canonical hierarchy); and any nationalities not already represented in other ways. Furthermore, Syndesmos will have the power of co-opting a limited number of individuals who might be useful to it, regardless of membership of any particular Church, organization or nationality. But all members must have the blessing of their canonical Bishops.

Syndesmos will carry on its activities through a Conference, a Committee consisting of six members elected by the Conference and not more than four co-opted members, and a General Secretariat to deal with all current matters.

Both in electing and co-opting members, the different nationalities and jurisdictions must be borne in mind, so that none should be forgotten and none over-represented. The members of the Committee must all live in the same town for the smooth working of the scheme. It was unanimously decided that at present Paris is just such a centre. But it was clear from the beginning that the most difficult problem would be the choice of a General Secretary. All agreed that the whole responsibility and initiative in the work would be his: so it would be all the more difficult to find someone who would be suitable both personally and in jurisdiction and nationality. P. A. Evdokimov, who was Chairman of one of the discussion groups, proposed Professor L. A. Zander. But the Rumanian group hotly opposed him, considering that in spite of his authority he would be unsuitable because of his age (they wanted a *young* secretary) and the one-sidedness of his Church views. The Greeks, on the other hand, were most emphatic in their support of Professor Zander, pointing out his weight and connections in the Greek ecclesiastical world. Opinions were divided, so the Serbs suggested that the General Secretary should not be a Russian but a Greek, since in the Greek Church there are no "different jurisdictions" and such like difficulties. A representative of the Church of Greece was unanimously accepted as a second candidate—a theological student named John Lappas. But the Rumanian delegation then proposed that there should be a third candidate, a Serb. On the recommendation of the Priest of the Serbian Church in Paris, Fr. Vladimir Garič, Marko Marković, the secretary of the Serbian Church community, was chosen as third. He is a young man, a good organizer, who speaks several languages, and finished the Theological Academy in Paris. The candidates left the room,

and the discussion went on until the early hours of the next morning. It became clear that at the present time it would be wrong to hand over the running of Syndesmos to one person, and it was unanimously decided that there should be two General Secretaries. J. Lappas withdrew his candidature; so the names of M. Markovič and L. A. Zander were presented jointly for election at the plenary session. But here two other names were put up—Paul l'Huillier, an Orthodox French scholar of the Moscow jurisdiction, and J. F. Meyendorff, lecturer at the Theological Academy of St. Sergius (under the Constantinople Exarchate). There was a secret ballot, and Marko Markovič [1] and J. F. Meyendorff were elected.

They were to decide between themselves who should do the office work, and whose address should be the official one. They easily agreed that Marko Markovič should do the office work: and Syndesmos fixed him an appropriate salary out of its funds which would accrue from the monthly subscriptions of the various Churches, youth organizations and national groups that will form Syndesmos. Paul l'Huillier became a member of the Committee as a representative.

Thus the organization for linking together Orthodox Youth was formed —a great achievement when we consider all the difficulties that had to be overcome.

2. *Attitude to the Hierarchy.* This also was a difficult question. The Serbian delegation had prepared a list of all the existing Orthodox Patriarchates, etc., whose blessing Syndesmos should seek for its activities. The Serbs thus wanted to emphasize their own strictly canonical attitude, and the undividedness of the Serbian Church. But the representatives of the Church of the Russians-in-Exile were insistent that the Patriarchs should not be mentioned by name, and a phrase like "the chief Hierarchs" should be used: for they considered that Orthodox Youth could not turn to the Patriarch of Moscow for a blessing. Such an attitude was, however, inacceptable to the delegates of the Moscow jurisdiction, who, while they agreed that members of all other jurisdictions should take part in Syndesmos, and regarded that as in itself a good thing, naturally could not give up the blessing of their own Patriarch.

After a long discussion the following formula was evolved:—"With the blessing, prayers and guidance of all the Orthodox Patriarchs and heads of Autocephalous Churches." To make the hierarchical principle still clearer, the words were added, "And with the blessing of the local Bishop." Syndesmos itself should not apply for this blessing, but all its constituent members should apply, each to his own Patriarch or chief Bishop, according to his jurisdictional affiliation. In this way Orthodox Youth was united independently of its different jurisdictions, while each group remained faithful to its own hierarchy. The aim of Syndesmos is not to solve the problem of Church jurisdiction, but to work together for the good of Orthodoxy.

3. *Attitude to the Ecumenical Movement.* This question evoked an

[1] The address is: Mons. Marko Markovic, 9-bis, rue Jean de Beauvais, Paris Ve. All Orthodox, wherever they are, who are interested in "Syndesmos," are asked to write to this address, or (if in England) to Miss N. Theokritov, 36 Wynne Road, London, S.W. 9.

even more heated argument. On the actual invitation to the Conference was written "Centre of Orthodox Youth (in connection with the World Council of Churches)." The initiative came from circles connected with the Ecumenical Movement; and the question of this connection was apparently considered prejudged and undoubted. However, by no means all the delegates shared this view. It is well known that the majority of Orthodox Churches refused on ideological grounds to join the World Council of Churches. The Church of Greece at the last moment failed to send delegates to Lund. The Serbian Church, while maintaining good relations with Christians of other denominations and ecumenical organizations, is very cautious about its official participation in the movement. On the other hand the Ecumenical Patriarchate, and in particular its Russian Exarchate in Western Europe, take a very active part quite officially. For the Church of the Russians in exile this was one of the stumbling-blocks, and a cause of the unfortunate divisions as far back as 1926.

Thus the Orthodox Church as a whole has made no pronouncement on this subject: and for many delegates, to treat the answer to this question as a foregone conclusion would have meant usurping the rights of their Bishops. In practice it would have meant that Syndesmos, instead of being truly "pan-Orthodox," would have become a one-sided and provincial "child of Ecumenism."

The Serbian delegation, which was agreed within itself, considered that official mention of a link with the World Council of Churches would divide Orthodox Youth into two camps, and thus prove to be "anti-ecumenical" by separating those who so far had been united. They proposed that in the resolution it should be said that Syndesmos is not a part of any religious organization formed outside the Orthodox Church, or of the Ecumenical Movement. This proposal called forth a heated argument, ending in a unanimous agreement not to mention the word "ecumenical," or the World Council of Churches, at all, but just to point out that Syndesmos is independent of all non-Orthodox organizations. The word "ecumenical" appeared, however, in the resolution on missionary work, where it dealt with the attitude of the Orthodox in preaching to Christians of other denominations. The Serbs proposed that here too the word should be omitted to avoid any misunderstandings. Their proposal was accepted, and the phrase "a brotherly attitude" was substituted.

So Syndesmos is not part of the Ecumenical Movement nor of any of its organizations, and will not be until a decision has been reached by the whole Orthodox Church. But it leaves its members free to follow the ruling of their own local hierarchy in this matter.

4. *Nationality and territorial boundaries.* This question was no less awkward. The reader has already seen how the misunderstanding with the Serbian delegation began over this particular matter. It was further complicated by the fact that the organizers of the Conference held the theological view about territorial boundaries—i.e., that more than one Orthodox jurisdiction could not exist within the same territory. For theological reasons the Georgian Church in France put itself under the jurisdiction of the Constantinopolitan Exarch, considering him the

"local" Bishop for all Orthodox in Western Europe, since "Western Europe is a territory of the Ecumenical Patriarchate." Conversely the Serbs, who for a long time were unable to procure themselves a separate Church, absolutely refused to leave the jurisdiction of their own Patriarch, and denied the theory of a "local" Bishop in France. This attitude was taken up by some other national groups, sometimes in an extremely chauvinistic form. Argument was very fierce, particularly in connection with the lectures. People were so carried away by the extremity of these views that they began to forget that the main point was *agreement*, and not a dissection of jurisdictions; that all the canons of the Church had this aim in view, but no single method of achieving it.

Reconciliation was effected during the discussion by Fr. Vasily Zenkovsky with a remarkably successful formula, which was particularly surprising in view of the accepted opinion of the Theological Academy of St. Sergius in Paris. Fr. Vasily said that we have here the result of sin (the Tower of Babel): but at the same time it is Divine Providence which sanctifies man through his national culture, and so brings him nearer to God. It is however unnatural for Orthodox people in the same territory not to be together. So both the national and the territorial principle have equal rights in the Orthodox Church. This should be the practical solution:—those who consider themselves to be permanent residents in a given territory should try to unite themselves in a single jurisdiction under the local Bishop; but those who are in a given place temporarily, and hope to return to their native land, have good reason to remain in the jurisdiction of their national mother-Church. It follows that parallel jurisdictions in the same territory are quite possible, though only as exceptions, and with the mutual agreement of the Hierarchy in a spirit of Love.

This new attitude among the members of the Theological Academy of St. Sergius may have far-reaching results. The different jurisdictions in the Orthodox Church may be able to make peace—as did the Orthodox Youth at the Conference—and the local Churches come to an agreement.

5. *Methods of Church Work with Young Orthodox.* There was little disagreement over the missionary tasks of Orthodoxy, and the "layman's task." Every one quickly agreed on the main issues. But the working out of these questions was valuable, thanks to the detailed attention they received in study groups. There is no time to deal with them here, but they might form the subject of another article.

When we gathered together for the final Liturgy, we felt that something really great had happened. The Spirit of God had conquered the evil one. That was clear to all, and we gave thanks to the Lord. We thanked too the initiators and organizers of the Conference with the warmest appreciation for their selfless work, which gave us the chance of feeling and realizing our Orthodox unity.

Words of thanks were spoken in their own languages by delegates on behalf of the national Churches during the final brotherly Easter meal.

VLADIMIR RODZIANKO,
Priest of the Serbian Church in London.

THE BYZANTINE CONGRESS AT SALONICA, APRIL 1953

THE Ninth International Congress on Byzantine Studies began at 9 a.m. on the first Sunday after Easter with a celebration of the Liturgy in the church of the Holy Wisdom at Salonica. This ancient city, named after Alexander the Great's sister, is a fitting place for a gathering of this kind to take place. It played an important part in the later history of the Empire, it was the chief centre of the Hesychast controversy, and it contains a number of very fine Byzantine churches. Although it was liberated from the Turks only just over thirty years ago, it already owns a flourishing university, within whose walls most of our activities took place.

After the Liturgy we made our way in the rain to the university, where in the great hall under the fresco of St. Demetrius, patron and protector of the city, after a prayer from the metropolitan the Congress was officially declared open by His Majesty King Paul of the Hellenes. Then began the complimentary speeches: first we were welcomed by the Greek officials of the Congress, and afterwards the representatives of over twenty different nations expressed their pleasure at attending the Congress in five different languages and many more different styles. The delegate from Austria spoke ancient Greek, and several others used the modern language instead of their own. Reference was made to St. Paul's sojourn in the city, and to the fact that Gregory Palamas and the apostles to the Slavs, St. Cyril and St. Methodius, had had their home there.

The next day the serious work of the Congress began. In the mornings from half-past nine till one papers were delivered in different sections: archaeology, history, literature, theology, law, and on one day only folk-lore. Those scholars whose interests were not strictly confined to one section found inevitably that they had to miss several of the papers they would have liked to hear as there were always four or five being delivered simultaneously in different rooms. This difficulty was increased by the tendency of many speakers to exceed the fifteen-minute limit, so that it was impossible to tell how much of its daily programme any section other than one's own had at any moment accomplished. The most popular section was probably the archaeological, whose work was continued in the first two afternoons by visits to the churches of the city conducted by Professor Sotiriou and Professor Pelekanides. One of the most interesting was the Church of the Twelve Apostles, with its beautiful but very fragmentary mosaics of the great festivals, which were only recently discovered. It was not of course possible to examine the churches adequately in so large a crowd, or to hear all the explanations provided, but there were plenty of opportunities to visit them again at one's leisure. On two other afternoons papers were given as in the mornings, and on the fifth day there was a performance of Greek folk songs and dances in the theatre. On four evenings there were receptions, and on the fifth a concert of modern Greek music was given. On the Saturday afternoon we were invited to evening prayers in the church of the Holy Wisdom, for which the metropolitan had provided an English version, so it was possible to follow the whole of the impressive service right up to the blessing of the loaves at the end. The next day there was the final meeting in the great hall of the university, when speeches of thanks were

made by the various delegates, and hope was expressed that we should meet again at Constantinople in 1955 for the Tenth Congress.

Although the Congress proper was now at an end, the next week was occupied by the related activity of two excursions, the first in eight motor buses to Kastoria, and the second by boat round Mount Athos, where a day was spent, and then by bus from Kavalla to Philippi, Drama, and Servae. We went first to Vérrhoia (Berea) where St. Paul was sent after the uproar in Salonica. Here we listened to an address from the mayor, and visited a tiny frescoed church. After lunch overlooking a deep valley on the other side of which rose the snow-capped peaks of Pieria, we passed through Kozani and reached Kastoria, near the Albanian border, in the evening. It is a small town on the neck of a peninsula in Lake Kastoria, which served as the place of exile for Byzantine political prisoners, who built over three hundred churches, of which only seventy-two now remain. The inhabitants now live by the fur trade. There is only one hotel, so the eight bus loads of visitors were accommodated in the private houses of many Kastorians who had willingly offered hospitality for two nights to the visitors. The next day we were shown some of the many churches, which are of the basilica type, only one being domed. A number of them contain frescoes of great interest. In the afternoon we were taken by boat to the Mavriotissa monastery further along the peninsula, where there are two churches with frescoes both inside and out, one of them containing a very full series of the life and miracles of Christ. That evening at a reception the freedom of the town was presented to Professor H. Grégoire from Brussels, and to Professor A. A. Vasiliev of Dumbarton Oaks. The following day we returned to Salonica through magnificent scenery near the Albanian and Yugoslav borders, stopping on the way at Edessa to admire the waterfalls.

The excursion to Athos was of the greatest interest. At dawn we approached the Holy Mountain, which rose sheer to its snowy height from a grey smooth sea. The ship coasted slowly along both sides of the peninsula, so that the monasteries with their welcoming monks could be clearly seen. Landings were made at three monasteries, Dochiariou, Vatopedi, and Dionysiou. The attempt of five women to join in these landings was the talk of the local newspapers for days afterwards.

What chiefly remains in the memory after returning home from the Congress, apart from the beauty of many places visited, is the unfailing hospitality and kindness of the Greeks. The secretary, Professor Zepos, whom we have to thank for the splendid organization of the Congress, made it his business to give each member a personal welcome, and the general atmosphere was friendly rather than official. The generous hospitality offered to the Congress quite as a matter of course by the Kastorians has already been mentioned. The whole fortnight was an unforgettable experience, which future Byzantine Congresses will find it hard to rival.

ELFRIDE BICKERSTETH.

THE "FILIOQUE" DISPUTE AND ITS IMPORTANCE

by VLADIMIR RODZIANKO

IT is very difficult to speak about this old dispute between the Eastern and the Western halves of Christendom without pointing out straight away its great importance. There is a tendency to-day, both in the East and in the West, to present it as a logomachy of the old days, to use Fr. Bulgakov's term—as an obscure inheritance from the darkness of the Middle Ages—and simply to neglect it as unimportant. There are people in Church circles to-day who even do not know its meaning, or have never heard of it at all.

At the same time Roman Catholic theology simply states that any opposition to the "Filioque" is the "Greek error," and there is no real *problem* in it at all, and it is not really important except for those who are devoted to special studies, or for practical questions of the Uniate Movement. There is nothing really new on the subject in Roman theology since the Councils of Lyon and Florence,[1] except a few articles in which Roman Catholic writers express the view that a solution of the problem is really needed. But they are very few and exceptional. We shall speak of them later on. Otherwise the whole tradition of the East concerning this subject is neglected in the West, and is often forgotten in the East itself.

In the Anglican and the Protestant world at large there is little interest in the "Filioque" problem, except for some valuable pieces of historical research in the last century, which we shall also mention later on in the course of this lecture.

I myself think that such an attitude is not a sign of any progress in theology or spiritual life, but its very opposite: it shows the ever-increasing spirit of lukewarmness and indifference which is so threatening to Christianity as a whole to-day, especially in the face of the new and powerful spirit of materialistic religion which vigorously confronts us.

The whole history of this dispute, which began much more than a thousand years ago, and has continued to such dates as 1947 and 1950,[2] shows that there is something really important underlying it.

It is our task to find out its meaning, and to try to give the real answers to the questions it raises.

First of all we must look more carefully at its history. Usually it is

[1] Both of these were summoned by the See of Rome, the first in A.D. 1274, the second in A.D. 1439, after diplomatic negotiations with the Greek Emperors, in order to establish the reunion of the Greeks with the Church of Rome. At these Councils the official teaching of the Roman Church about the "Filioque" was accepted as dogma. Largely based on St. Augustine's teaching, it stated that the Father and the Son constitute the one *principium* of the Holy Spirit, who proceeds "*ab ambobus tamquam ab uno principio.*" The Council of Florence moreover declared that the Greek formula, "*ex Patre per Filium,*" was quite as correct as the Latin "*ex Patre Filioque.*" Hence came the official Roman theology of "*principium principatum*"—i.e. that the Father is the "original principle" and the Son the "originated principle" of the Holy Ghost (St. Augustine, *De Trinitate*, P.L. T. 42, cols. 1095–1096; Mansi, *Concil*, t. XXIV, col. 81; t. XXXI, cols. 1030, 1031; Palmieri, "Esprit Saint" in *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, Paris, 1913, 813; *Kohomsky Khristianskoye Chteniye*, 1875, 298).

[2] In October, 1947, a Conference was arranged at Blackfriars, Oxford, concerning the Procession of the Holy Spirit, at which papers on the subject were read by Roman Catholic, Anglican and Orthodox theologians (*Eastern Churches Quarterly*, Supplementary Issue, Vol. VII, 1948). In 1950 a similar Conference was held in France at Saulchoir ("Russie et Chrétienté," 1950, Nos. 3–4).

limited to the East-West dispute itself. Although some writers on the subject mention earlier dates, they still consider its real beginning to be on that day in the seventh century when, according to St. Maximus the Confessor, the Greeks reproached the Latins for their use of the "Filioque." [3]

Secondly, it is usually looked at in isolation from the historical and dogmatic background. Writers argue with each other, or try to find some solution, simply on one point—whether the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father *and* the Son, or from the Father *alone*.

In such terms, and in such isolation, it does seem a useless logomachy, and one feels that it is better not to think of it at all.

But it is not so. For we cannot and must not isolate it either historically or dogmatically. We all know very well how unscholarly it is to take a word or an expression out of its context, neglecting its broad meaning, and to argue only on one narrow point. If it is true of philology or general history, why is it not the same with theology or Church history? We must be grateful to Fr. Bulgakov, who first noticed that isolation and opened the doors for further investigation in his most interesting study on the Holy Ghost, "The Paraclete." [4] But it is strange to see how he himself cannot escape from that vicious circle, and is bound by an isolation similar to that which he himself combats.

We have no time in this short lecture to present Fr. Bulgakov's theology as a whole. But we can outline his main ideas on the subject, which Professor Lossky describes as "breach of equilibrium." [5]

It is false, says Fr. Bulgakov, to think that God the Father is the origin or source, in the causalistic sense of the Greek "*αἰτία*," of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and that they are "derivations" or "duae processiones" out of Him. There is no "becoming" in God, but eternal co-existence of the three Divine Persons. The scriptural words "begetting" and "proceeding" only describe the modes of existence, "*τρόποι τῆς ὑπάρξεως*," and nothing else. They only mean the mutual relations of the Three in One, of which the Father is the first as God "par excellence." Both sides in the dispute, he says, not excluding the Ancient Fathers, are wrong when they speak of the problem of the origin of the Holy Ghost as *from a cause*. There is no cause or *principium*, in this sense, in the Godhead at all, and therefore the main point of the dispute itself is removed: it is lawful to say both—"*Ex Patre Filioque*" and "*ἐκ μόνου τοῦ Πατρός*." The whole argument of the Latins at Lyon and at Florence—"*ab uno principio*" and "*principium principatum*"—on one side, and the Photian argument of the Greeks against "*δύο ἀρχαί*" [6] on the other, are dropped.

[3] In his Letter to Marinus, a priest in Cyprus, St. Maximus defends the Romans for their use of the term (P.G., XCI, col. 136). Anastasius the Librarian of Rome in the ninth century refers to this letter in Latin (*ibid.*, 133, 136). The passage was read by St. Mark of Ephesus at Florence (23rd Session).

[4] Y.M.C.A. Press, Paris, 1936, p. 93.

[5] "L'équilibre entre l'essence et les hypostases est rompu . . . en faveur de l'hypostase." Vladimir Lossy, "La Procession du Saint-Esprit dans la doctrine trinitaire orthodoxe." Paris, 1948, p. 31.

[6] The argument of St. Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, who accused the Latins in his *Mystagogia* of introducing "two principles in the Godhead—the Father and the Son." It is to combat this accusation that the Councils of Lyon and Florence introduced the formula "*tamquam ab uno principio.*" (Photius, "Λόγος *περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος μυσταγωγίας*"—P.G., CII, 280–392; *δύο αἰτίαι*—*ibid.*, 292.)

Speaking both in terms of "*Ex Patre Filioque procedit*" and of "ἐκ μόνου τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον," Fr. Bulgakov unites them in one, but isolates himself from the dogmatic and historical background both of the Patristic times and of the dispute itself.

In this particular problem it is really difficult to agree with Fr. Bulgakov's very interesting and philosophical, but at the same time very personal, arguments. If we are to speak about the "Filioque" dispute as it was and as it is, we must first of all accept the main idea of all parties in it, based on the Trinitarian theology of the great Cappadocians on which they all unanimously agree.[7] It is, of course, a matter of personal conviction either to believe it or not: but it is difficult to be a Catholic (which for us means "Orthodox") and not to accept in faith the unanimous catholic tradition of the Church.

The isolation of the "Filioque" is really *fatal*. Since the bitter fight between East and West began, people have become, one may almost say, absolutely blind on this particular point. And here we must agree with Fr. Bulgakov, that the lack of love, which is always a gift of the Holy Ghost, and the existence at the same time of the spirit of Schism, which is always opposite to Him, made it impossible to understand and profess the real doctrine on His Divine Person for so many centuries.

St. Maximus the Confessor was in fact not the first to deal with the matter, but the last to speak on it without bitterness. And perhaps we shall find the key to the problem in that famous letter of his to the Priest Marinus, preserved by Anastasius the Librarian, and read at Florence.

This letter is usually quoted by Eastern theologians for the sake of the words in it, "Ita eum procedere fateamur ex Filio, missionem nimirum," [8] and hence comes into existence a very large theological school of thought in the Orthodox Church, which explains all patristic texts, sometimes even those of St. Augustine, with their terms of "δι' Υἱοῦ," "per Filium," or "Filioque," as referring to the "temporal mission" only, and not to the eternal procession in any sense.[9] It appears in the "Circular Epistle" of the Eastern Patriarchs,[10] so finding its way into present-day Greek theology, being introduced much earlier by Adam Zernikav [11] and

[7] St. Basil the Great, St. Gregory of Nazianzus, and St. Gregory of Nyssa, who first introduced into theological language the term αἰτία, meaning the "essential cause," with reference to the Father as the source of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.

[8] St. Maximus, defending the Latins, said that the difference is only one of language: they translate by "*procedit*" two different Greek terms, "ἐκπορεύεται" and "πρόεισι," the last one being translated back into Latin by Anastasius as "missionem." Perhaps the Latins had erred simply on account of the limited nature of their language, "inasmuch as they employ the same term to denote the causation of the *communication* of the Holy Ghost, and the causation of His *being*"—says Theophylact, Archbishop of Ochrida, five centuries later. (Dr. A. Neander, *General History of the Church*, Vol. VI, p. 421.)

[9] The Greek Fathers of the first six centuries use the term "Through the Son," and even "From the Son," but never with "ἐκπορεύεται." They always use "πρόεισιν" or similar verbs. It seems that St. Augustine and other Latin writers used the "Filioque procedit" in the same sense. The question is, what is the real meaning of that "πρόεισιν." The theological school of thought we are speaking of thinks it to be temporal, and distinct from the eternal procession—the sending of the Holy Ghost by the Son into this world only.

[10] "Okrujnoye Poslaniye Edinoy Svyatoy Sobornoy i Apostolskoy Cerkvi." Khristianskoye Chteniye, 1849, p. 168.

[11] Adam Zernikav, Studies on the procession of the Holy Ghost (in Russian) Pochayev, 1902.

accepted by the Metropolitan Theophanes Prokopovich of Novgorod,[12] as well as by the Metropolitan Makary of Moscow[13]: the same opinion was represented by some of the Orthodox delegates at the Bonn Conferences in 1874 and 1875,[14] and was expressed in a very valuable study on the subject by Archimandrite Silvester,[15] translated into German and published under the title, "Antwort auf die in dem altkatholischen Schema enthaltene Bemerkung von dem Heiligen Geiste." The well-known Serbian dogmatist, Fr. Justin Popovich, introduced this argument without any change or comment into Serbian dogmatics,[16] and it was accepted by the Serbs without reserve so far as I know. And we still hear it nowadays at the Oxford conference of 1947, and the Saulchoir Conference of 1950, though with some reservations.

I do not think this is what St. Maximus meant—at any rate not with such a sharp distinction between the eternal and the temporal as is supposed by this school of thought. Thus there came about a double isolation of the term—from its historical *and* its theological background.

Another theological school of thought in the East, much more learned, which was represented by the famous Bolotov[17] in his *Thesen uber das Filioque* published in *Internationale Theologische Zeitschrift* in 1898, was opposed to it. His and his followers' opinion was that the "Filioque" is not an *impedimentum dirimens* for reunion. That opinion was largely based on historical researches, and on the common reconciling formula of St. John of Damascus, "δι' Υἱοῦ ἐκπορευόμενον,"[18] which was understood in the Eastern tradition and accepted by the majority of the Orthodox delegates at Bonn.[19] Such was the resolution of the Conference. But, as Palmieri stated it, the solution of the problem by the Old Catholics did not appease the conflict on that ground between East and West. Neither of them could actually depart from their own teaching—the "Filioque" on the one side, the "ἐκ μόνου" on the other.[20] It seems to be irreconcilable: the Orthodox insist upon the "Monarchy" of the Father: the Son and the Holy Ghost are one in Him; they are both from Him, and

[12] "Istoriya o iskhojdeniyi Sv. Dukha." Moscow, 1773.

[13] Macaire, Eveque de Vinitza (Bulgakov, later Metropolitan of Moscow) "Theologie dogmatique orthodoxe" traduite par un Russe. Paris, 1859, pp. 391–414.

[14] The Old Catholics, after their secession from the See of Rome, were seeking reunion with the Orthodox Church and with the Anglican Church. On their initiative two theological conferences were held at Bonn in 1874 and 1875, where the most eminent theologians from all national Orthodox Churches, and from the Church of England, were present.

[15] Archimandrite, later Bishop, Silvester was a famous Russian dogmatist at the Church Academy in Kiev. Publ. St. Petersburg, 1875.

[16] J. Popovich, *Dogmatics*, Belgrade, 1934.

[17] V. V. Bolotov was a famous professor of Church History at the Church Academy in St. Petersburg. He took part in the Commission of the Holy Synod appointed for the reunion of the Old Catholics with the Orthodox Church, under the presidency of Metropolitan Antony, in A.D. 1892.

[18] It was studied, in connection with the teaching of St. John of Damascus, by another representative of that school—Bogorodsky.

[19] St. Tarasius of Constantinople and St. John of Damascus were the first and the last of the Greek Fathers to use the term "δι' Υἱοῦ" with "ἐκπορεύεται." It is difficult to say what they really meant by it. Bolotov and others thought it to refer to the eternal relation of the Holy Ghost to the Father and the Son, not as cause of His being, but as condition of it. Silvester and others thought it to refer to the temporal mission, like προέσιν.

[20] Palmieri, "Filioque" in *Dict. de Theologie Catholique*, Paris, 1913, p. 2339.

from Him only—ἐκ μόνου τοῦ Πατρός: the Westerns insist on the completeness of the Trinitarian relations—"Filioque." Here are two different approaches to the same problem of the Triune God. And both are equally important. But they exclude each other! The "per Filium" seemed to be at Bonn (as much earlier at Florence) only a compromise.

The Orthodox who accepted "δι' Υἱοῦ" were bitterly attacked by the other school of thought, and very interesting discussion followed for more than forty years. The Bolotov school was less isolationist, for it looked back to the ancient Church teaching. But it could not escape the isolation altogether. The problem was still being approached from the same angle —if not "Filioque," nor "ἐκ μόνου," then "per Filium"—which was, as a matter of fact, an obvious surrender to the Western tradition. "Le résultat de ces polémiques a été nul—et après une lutte théologique de quarante ans, la question du Filioque attend encore sa solution," is the conclusion of the famous Roman Catholic theologian.[21]

The Right Rev. Cassian, Bishop of Catania and Professor of the Orthodox Academy of St. Sergius in Paris, tried at the Saulchoir Conference to represent both these Orthodox schools of thought, insisting on the isolation of the eternal procession from the temporal mission in the New Testament, and at the same time accepting the "δι' Υἱοῦ" formula of the Fathers in its Bonn interpretation.[22]

At Oxford Professor V. Lossky, who defended there the Eastern cause three years earlier (1947), went on the same path much more theologically. He published a year later (1948) his "essai" in French [23] where he tried to show the real meaning of the "δι' Υἱοῦ" avoiding the isolation of the "temporal" procession from the "eternal" on the one hand, and the acceptance of the "principium principatum" (in any sense) on the other. But he could not avoid another thing: "the clear distinction between the hypostatic existence of the Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father alone and His eternal shining forth from the Son." The first, he said, was "hypostatic," the second only of "one substance." [24]

But then comes another difficulty: the sharp distinction between the "hypostatic" and "substantial" processions of the *person* of the Holy Ghost, even if we call it in Greek προείσιν or ἐκλάμπει, makes Him to proceed in a much more *double* way than under the Latin interpretation of "una spiratio duorum." And that was the reason why the Eastern theologians, like Zernikav (in spite of the fact that he himself was purely Western by origin), preferred to interpret that δι' Υἱοῦ προείσιν as of a purely temporal mission.

[21] Palmieri, *ibid.*, p. 2335.

[22] S. Ex. Mgr. Cassien, "L'enseignement de la Bible sur la procession du Saint-Esprit," in *Russie et Chrétienté*, 1950, p. 125.

[23] *Op. cit.*

[24] *Ibid.*, 32. That same argument was mentioned, as an eastern opinion, by W. Palmer last century (*Dissertations on the Eastern Orthodox Church*, Oxford, 1853). As a matter of fact it had its history in the course of the dispute: "Ce n'est pas un 'dévelopement dogmatique,' mais une seule et même tradition defendue sur des points differents par les orthodoxes, de S. Photius á Georges de Chypre et St. Grégoire Palamas" (Lossky, 32). Father Bulgakov remarks about that tradition: "what actually that 'eternal shining forth' as distinct from the procession means is difficult to understand" ("The Paraclete," p. 134).

G E V A

So we must go back to St. Maximus the Confessor. But we shall not touch here upon the history of the whole problem in the West, especially in Spain, before and immediately after St. Maximus, as it would take too much time. When the first objections were raised by the Greeks, St. Maximus reconciled them with the Latins in a most marvellous way.[25] But when, a century and a half later, the matter fell into the hands of Charlemagne, even the Pope, Leo III, could not altogether stop his initiative. The sad date of the Jerusalem trouble and of the Aachen Council of A.D. 809 [26] is the real date of the beginning of the Schism. The later dates, 860 and 1054, are only the consequences. The "Filioque" term became (probably very sincerely, as is usual in such cases of schismatical blindness) a sacred flag of the political struggle of the Western Empire against the Eastern. It was only natural that the irenic attitude of Leo III and of such of his contemporaries as Anastasius the Librarian, could not long maintain itself even in Rome itself and the Filioque was subsequently introduced into the Creed even in the Papal Chapel, in spite of its having been so energetically forbidden by the Pope himself "pro amore et cautela orthodoxae fidei," as Anastasius informs us. The first Western theologian who made, at Charlemagne's request, a collection of Patristic texts to defend the Filioque against the Greeks—without any polemics, however—was Theodulph, Bishop of Orleans. But the following words of his speak for themselves:—

"Tuque manum injicias, vegetat quem Spiritus ille,
Causa tuo cuius tempore coepit agi." [27]

And his collection, half a century before Photius, was the real starting-point of that isolation from Catholicism which was one and the same both for the Latin term in its conception and for the Church of the West as a whole.

The subsequent history of the dispute in the West becomes ever more and more characteristic of that isolation. St. Anselm of Canterbury in his "De processione Spiritus Sancti contra Graecos," [28] and St. Thomas Aquinas in his "Contra errores Graecorum," [29] both speak in the same

[25] We do not know exactly how he did it. His letter and its references and quotations are too short and obscure. But it is evident that he achieved it without any compromise or misunderstanding. The present problem of the "temporal" and the "eternal" did not exist at that time at all. Such a distinction is typical only of later centuries.

[26] The Greek monk John accused the Latin monks who came to Jerusalem from Charlemagne of heresy because of the Filioque in their Creed. These monks said it was the custom of the Emperor's Chapel, and wrote letters to the Pope and to Charlemagne, who used this as a good excuse for accusing the Greek Empire of heresy at Aachen.

The Caroline Books however reveal to us that Charlemagne was the first to make accusations of heresy—long before the Jerusalem incident and the Council of Aachen. As soon as he received the reports of the seventh Ecumenical Council, he wrote to Pope Hadrian accusing the Patriarch Tarasius for his use of the term "per Filium" and not "Filioque," and for his veneration of the Images. The Pope replied to him that this was quite orthodox, but he repeated his accusations after the Pope's death. His purely political aims are evident. (Libr. Carol. III, 3; P.L., XCVIII, 1117.)

[27] "And do thou put in thy hand, who art quickened by that same Spirit
Whose cause in thy time only begins to be moved."
—Theodulph, De Spiritu Sancto veterum Patrum sententiae quod a Patre Filioque procedit: P.L., CV (2) 239–275; 241.

[28] P.L., CLVIII, 285–326.

[29] St. Thom. Aq., "Contra Err. Gr. ad Urbanum IV," Rome, 1880, 449–481; Palmieri, *op. cit.*, 824.

spirit and way: whether or not? St. Thomas, as is typical for the whole of his theology, especially in the "De Trinitate" and in the Summa, looks at this particular subject in his own peculiar way; and hence come the classical Roman arguments of the "una spirátio duorum" and the "ab uno principio," as well as of the "distinctio Spiritus Sancti a Filio," taken from St. Augustine, but explained in a scholastic way very different from that of the saint.

And the enormous list of Western writers on the subject through the centuries, including Paul Henry, Gamelot and Dondaine of our own days, add nothing new to these classical arguments apart from more or less interesting personal explanations of it,[30] or illustrious historical researches by Anglican and Old-Catholic theologians such as Swete [31] and Howard,[32] or Döllinger, Langen and Reusch.[33] They all still keep to the same spirit of isolation. How difficult it is to escape from it!

Still, it would be true to say that both at Oxford and at Saulchoir considerable progress was made in this direction by the Eastern and the Western schools alike. But the main atmosphere was the same—"Patristic talmudism," as Dr. Zander once described the Saulchoir Conference, where he was present.

So we are now confronted with this isolation in the two following forms:—

(1) from historical theology, in Fr. Bulgakov's fight against the opposite extreme, and

(2) from the theological problem as a whole, in the dispute itself.

It is impossible for us here, in a lecture which is only an introduction, to solve the problem at once. It needs a great deal more of research and proofs. But what we can do here is to define the following four questions, and try to give the answers to them:—

(1) Why is the dispute so important, and wherein does its importance lie?

(2) How can we escape from the isolation of the problem?

(3) What is the real message of both, the historical and dogmatical inheritance of the Church?

(4) Can the problem really be solved?

(1) "Filioque is a theological formula of great dogmatic and historical importance," says A. J. Maas in the *Catholic Encyclopaedia* of 1910 edited in New York (p. 73). But he does not say that it is a *problem* of importance. There are no *problems* in the dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church. Yet Paul Henry in 1947 goes further: he draws "not unimportant conclusions—concerning the possibility or necessity of expressing one and the same dogma by means of more than one set of metaphysical categories. On theoretical lines, it would appear that one dogma at least is officially expressed by the Catholic Church, united at Lyon and Florence,

[30] *E.C.Q.*, VII, Suppl. Issue, 1948; *Russie et Chrétienté*, 1950, Nos. 3–4.

[31] H. B. Swete, *On the History of the Doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit*, Cambridge, 1876.

[32] G. B. Howard, *The Schism between the Oriental and Western Churches with special reference to the addition of the Filioque to the Creed*: London, 1892.

[33] H. P. Liddon, *Report of the Conference at Bonn*, 1876; Reusch, *Theologisches Literaturblatt*, No. 21, 1875, Bonn. (Dr. Langen on Silvester's book.)

in two formulations which are not strictly equivalent or identical, but complementary. If this plurality of systematic expression is possible or even necessary for one revealed truth, it might not be impossible or unnecessary for other data of the one divine revelation—The much controverted dogma of the procession of the Spirit is not or should not be, as is generally thought, the main dividing line between Eastern and Western Christianity, but, paradoxically, their central, God-centred, uniting point." [34]

" Le Centre d'étude Russe-Istina, [illegible] Roman Catholic Society, goes in 1950 even further than this: " La question de la Procession du Saint-Esprit *a Filio* n'a cessé de tenir une place importante—il est bien évident—qu'aussi longtemps que le problème ainsi posé demeurera sans solution, toute perspective de liquidation du schisme d'Orient se trouvera fermée—dans le cadre de rencontres amicales périodiques entre théologiens catholiques et théologiens orthodoxes, cette question du Filioque est venue à l'ordre du jour." [35]

While the lukewarmness of present-day Christians generally simply refuses to notice the problem, there is a small minority, both in the East and in the West, who are longing to see it as " their central, God-centred, uniting point." And the more they study, the more they realize its enormous importance not only for the dogmatics or ecclesiastical practice of their Churches, but for their spiritual life itself.

Its importance lies first of all in the coming back to the Orthodox life of Christians in and with the Blessed and Undivided Trinity, as revealed to the Catholic Church. We believe [36] that this revelation is everlasting, and the spiritual life of the Church in the Triune God was, is, and ever shall be, one and the same. We believe that all dogmatic definitions are only the explanations in words of some parts of that mystical life; translations into human logical terms of the supra-logical Divine World to which we are called. We do not accept the idea of the evolution of dogmas independently of that unique Eternal Life which is the only source of all the doctrines. The whole revelation given us is there: there is nothing to add to it: its wholeness is not in human terms, but in the Spirit Himself who is with us and in us, as the Soul of the Body, the Church of Christ. We believe that the solution of all the problems is already there; we have only to accept them on our way to God, and in our obedience to the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, to her orthodox oneness and wholeness. Our Saints knew that solution very often without any theological training and without special terms, like St. Seraphim of Sarov, but they knew it with much wisdom and understanding. We believe that we cannot come to the genuine answers by study only, or by isolated logical terms in themselves. The Fathers of the Church, and the Ecumenical Councils, were orthodox only when they obeyed that general rule. All their definitions, accepted as

[34] Rev. Fr. Paul Henry, S.J., " On some implications of the ' Ex Patre Filioque tamquam ab Uno Principio,' " *E.C.Q., loc. cit.*, p. 29.

[35] " The question of the Procession of the Holy Ghost *à Filio* has not ceased to be of great importance—It is evident—that so long as this problem is not solved, all hopes for the liquidation of the Eastern Schism will be found closed—In the framework of periodical friendly meetings between Catholic and Orthodox theologians, this question of the Filioque has become the order of the day." *Russie et Chrétienté, loc. cit.*, p. 123.

[36] In saying this, I try to represent the belief of the Orthodox Church. V.R.

dogmas by the Church, were such only when they reflected that supra-logical everlasting spirituality—*a posteriori*, and not *a priori*.

We believe that the Divine Revelation on the nature of the Procession of the Holy Ghost is there too, preserved and spiritually expressed by the Orthodox Church. We have only to come and to drink from her living waters. But we know at the same time that there is no dogmatic definition of that part of Revelation made by the Church in words, just as there was not the "ὁμοούσιος" definition before the Council of Nicaea. And this means that the Revelation of the Holy Trinity—a revelation which was, is, and ever shall be, one and the same, and which exists in its *fulness* in the mystical life of the Church—has not yet been given its final definition in our human words, and we are still waiting for it. We deny the development of dogmas, but we acknowledge the development of definition. Without the definition of the nature of the relation of the Third Person to the First and Second, we cannot claim to have the Trinitarian dogma adequately defined in our words. The relations between the Father and the Son were, after a bitter dispute, defined by the Church in words historically in a very short time. It was then that the Deity of the Holy Ghost was defined, but nothing else. His Procession from the Father was taken literally from the Scriptures, without any explanation of its nature. Then the Christological questions emerged: and the teaching on the Holy Trinity was not then completed—the Filioque dispute later on was only the natural continuation of the Trinitarian problems of the first centuries. The process was interrupted by Christology for a comparatively short time—some three or four centuries. The Iconoclastic dispute was in fact a Christological one. And Christology itself was only one aspect of Triadology. It was, then, only natural that the *real* Ecumenical Councils, those recognised by East and West alike, should stop just there. The time had not yet come for definition of the main Trinitarian problem which was, and still remains, on the agenda. It was only mentioned in obscure terms by St. Tarasius at the seventh Ecumenical Council,[37] and became, as we see from the Caroline Books, the occasion of the twelve-centuries-long dispute. A real Ecumenical Council could not be summoned in such a bad spirit of bitterness, intrigue and hate, to proclaim the truth about the Spirit of Peace, Holiness and Love. And the Holy Spirit patiently waited for a change of heart.

The Western part of the Church proclaimed her one-sided teaching as the necessary dogma for the whole Church: and that was her main failure.

The Eastern part remained Orthodox, faithful to the ancient tradition and the ancient Creed, never presuming to proclaim as dogmas, in an "ecumenical" council, the extreme opinions of some of her theologians. She was waiting, and is waiting still.

It is really worth noticing that a Roman Catholic theologian can speak now in a manner so unusual for the Roman tradition as does Paul Henry.

[37] Πιστεύω εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Θεὸν ἡμῶν—καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ Κύριον καὶ ζωοποιοῦν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς δι Ὑιοῦ ἐκπορευόμενον Epist. ad Summos Sacerdotes, P.G., XCVIII, 1461.

It was this passage that Charlemagne attacked so strongly in his letter to Pope Hadrian—the real beginning of the quarrel.

It can only be explained by the words of "Istina"—"les rencontres *amicales*." For the first time in the history of the Church, the Filioque problem has been discussed by a small group of Christians in a really friendly way. Even the Bonn discussions of Eastern representatives with Old Catholics and Anglicans were not so simple and friendly—for the politics of the Russian and British Empires were underlying them. But now both the Eastern and the Western theologians were meeting without any earthly aims. They simply wanted to find the truth in one and the same Spirit of Truth about that same Spirit. And His fruits immediately came forth.

It is difficult to foresee how important these fruits will be for the future of the Christian Church. Only the future generations of Christians, confronting the neo-heathen world, will know it.

The Christian spiritual life cannot prosper without the spiritual, mystical solution of the "Filioque" problem. It seems strange, but it is so: all genuinely holy men actually achieved it. It means that the inner Life of the Holy Blessed and Undivided Trinity, not in terms of words but in the Holy Spirit Himself, must be present in the soul of a Christian. Without intellectual understanding, without verbal explanation, he is aware of the main mystery of the Three in One and One in Three, the completion of which is the Third Person and His eternal relation to the Father and to the Son. St. Paul knew it. St. Athanasius lived in it. St. Basil the Great spoke of it. And St. Augustine tried to express it in his Latin terms. They were not adequate: they were not complete: but they were a pious attempt to represent that which cannot be represented by a single man in its dogmatic simplicity and fullness. The greatest mistake of the Western followers of St. Augustine, especially in Spain,[38] was that they accepted his personal Latin terms as the fullness of the dogmatic expression of the Church, and fell into his one-sidedness. They failed to understand that only if we take all inspired words of different doctors of the Church, in their different languages, and combine them together, never isolating them either from their own general teachings or from the general teaching and history of the Church, can we have an adequate picture of that Divine Mystery in words. Such a picture, we foresee and hope, will come into the view of the real Eighth Ecumenical Council of the Catholic Church which some time in the near or far future—when God pleases, will define this dogma in infallible terms.

The spiritual life of the whole Church is tied to the Mystery of the Holy Trinity, no less than is that of every Christian in the world. And that means that all questions of doctrinal, canonical, and moral importance are dependent on it. The "Filioque" problem is the key to them all. And neither ecclesiology with her ecumenical problems, nor eschatology in her theory and practice, can come to a solution without the clear expression of the Faith in the Holy Ghost and His eternal procession—which the Church has, and always has had, in her heart. I do not think there is anything as important as that for all Christians in the world.

(2) I do not think, after all we have said, we need spent much time on

[38] Concilia Hispana, Madrit., ed. Garsia Lovisa. Kohomsky, *op. cit.*

the second question. There is only one way of escaping from the isolation of the problem—in love both to God and to men. If we speak about the Procession of the Holy Ghost remembering that it is not a "theory" only, or a "part of theology," or an "idea," but the very Life of God—we shall immediately turn to Him and try to see without words, in prayer, what we long for.

Secondly, we shall at once remember that our aim is *not* to combat and conquer each other, but to help each other to come as near as possible to what we want to see.

And thirdly—in practice, in our theological researches, we shall not start from St. Photius, or St. Maximus, or even St. Augustine, in terms of the East-West dispute, but from those Trinitarian problems and writers which are so characteristic of the Nicene and even ante-Nicene times.

(3) The real message of both the historical and the dogmatic inheritance of the Church will not be difficult to discover. It will show us that the main problem is not in the question, whether the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father alone, or from the Father and the Son together, or from the Father through the Son; nor in Fr. Bulgakov's question, whether the Father is the origin of the two other Persons, as the Catholic Church states, or not; but in the question, *what does the procession* (ἐκπόρευσις) *mean in itself, and what is its nature.* We shall find the implicit reply to this in many writings of the Fathers, and that will be all we need.

(4) I myself firmly believe that, if we proceed in that way, the problem *can and will be solved satisfactorily for the East and for the West*, without any compromise and without any loss of the importance of the problem. It will be simply a further explanation in words of the main Trinitarian Mystery, in full accordance with the Orthodox Faith of the Catholic Church. But of course we cannot accept as dogmas any of the existing definitions except what was stated in the Creed at its origin by the second Ecumenical Council at Constantinople in A.D. 381.

The Letter of St. Maximus to Marinus will explain the real cause of all misunderstandings—the difference between the Greek and Latin languages, their words and expressions.

All this means that our researches must be based on the three following scientific disciplines: (1) Theology, (2) History, and (3) Philology, combined together, and on those connected with them.

One thing we can state already—The Holy Ghost is leading His Church towards the solution of this problem: and we can see, after the thousand years of darkness, its wonderful dawn.

A HESYCHAST IN THE MAKING

(continued)

[In this second instalment of the Letters of Varsanuphius, we learn of the last stages in the active life of John of Beersheba, and of his final entry into the hesychastic cell. A third instalment will show us something of his trials within that life itself. D.J.C.]

XXIII. Question of the Same to the same Great Old Man:—I beseech thee, Father and Teacher, not to be wroth with me at the things

wherein I stumble; and to give me a rule how I should act in fasting and psalmody and prayer; and whether one should make a difference between days.

Answer:—

Brother if thou hadst given heed to the words of thy questions, thou mightest have observed what would enable thee to understand. Holding me as father and teacher, why also as wrathful? For a father is compassionate, having no wrath at all. And a teacher is long-suffering, and is a stranger to wrath. But as for the rule that thou askest—by many roundabout ways thou protractest thy *entering by the strait gate unto life*[1] eternal. Behold, Christ tells thee concisely how thou must enter. Leave the rules of men, and listen to Him saying that "*He that endureth unto the end, the same shall be saved.*"[2] If then a man has not endurance, he will not enter into life. Do not, then, want an ordinance. For I want thee *not* to be *under the law, but under grace.*[3] For He says, *Law is not made for a righteous man.*[4] And I want thee to be with the righteous. Hold to discernment as a helmsman steering the boat according to the winds. And when thou art sick, act accordingly in all the things of which thou didst write; and when thou art in health, accordingly. Since indeed when the body is sick, it does not receive food in its customary manner: so that in this also the rule has proved idle. And as for the days—hold them equal, holy, good. Do all things, then, with understanding, and it will issue for thee in Life that is in Christ Jesus our Lord. To Him be the glory unto the ages. Amen.

XXIV. When a division of opinion arose between him and the Abbot concerning a matter, and each of them was striving to be long-suffering, the Old Man sent them this answer, showing that their long-suffering was not clear of vexation, that they should always be watchful towards the perfectly unvexed condition:

Beloved child, do not suppose that it was of yourselves that you understood yesterday's chapter from the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Thessalonians. But I, knowing that the vaunting of your patience was mingled with wrath, prayed God for you that you might understand it. For in it lies all the force of the letters written from me by thee to brother John. And not only that, but give heed also to the chapters you are going to read to-day, I mean that of the Apostle Paul and that of the Holy Gospel; for they have the same force. And read them three times over, examining closely the force of the words, for the profit of your soul. For I am bearing you and caring for you according to God. Toil then together, and contend together to cut off from yourselves *wrath and anger.* For a struggle is needed, with God helping. The chapters are these:—from the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, from "*But we beseech you, brethren, to know them that labour among you, and are over you in the Lord,*"[5] to

[1] Matt. vii. 13–14.
[2] Matt. x. 22.
[3] Rom. vi. 15.
[4] 1 Tim. i. 9.
[5] 1 Thess. v. 12.

the end of the Epistle: likewise from the First to the Corinthians, from "*Now concerning spiritual gifts, brethren, we would not have you ignorant. Ye know that when ye were gentiles,*"[6] to "*Howbeit in the Church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I might instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue*"[7]: from the Gospel according to Matthew, from "*And Jesus went forth, and saw a great multitude, and was moved with compassion toward them, and he healed their sick.*"[8] to "*And they that were in the ship worshipped him, saying, 'Of a truth thou art the Son of God.'*"[9]

XXV. Answer of the same Great Old Man to the Same and the Abbot when they wanted to tighten up the rule all at once against the brethren:—

I say both to thee, my child, and to the brother—You have been written to before about long-suffering, and now I say, "*Milk out milk, and there shall be butter: but if thou tighten thy hand upon the teat, blood cometh forth.*"[10] And again St. Paul says, "*To the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain Jews,*"[11] et seq. Afterwards he says, "*I am become all things to all men, that I might by all means save some.*"[12] For if a man wants to bend back a tree or a vine, he bends it back gradually and it is not broken. But if he pulls it violently all at once, the thing is broken. Understand what I am saying.

XXVI. Answer of the same Great Old Man to the Same when he had revealed some things about which he had told him to tell no one, and for this cause had fallen into temptation; and about perfect long-suffering:—

Say to the brother—It is written, "*If any man have not the Spirit of God, he is none of his.*"[13] Give heed, from whence is come to thee the distraction of the anguish of the affliction of these thoughts, if it be not from the betrayal that has taken place, the transgression of my commandment. For I often commanded thee to tell no man the secret, and thou hast spread it abroad to many. Am I Christ—since when He commanded that they should tell no man, then they spread the word abroad exceedingly to the multitudes and to all men? But all the same, not to wound the thought of thy neighbour, this is the way of Christ, who came in great meekness and gentleness for the salvation of men. For if a man become not as a crumb, he cannot dwell with men. See that Christ said to His disciples, "*Ye did not choose me, but I chose you.*"[14] If then the calling of thy love unto us is from God and not from men, toil to obtain great patience. For to thee was written what was written of old—"*In your patience possess ye your*

[6] 1 Cor. xii. 1.
[7] *Ibid.*, xiv. 19.
[8] Matt. xiv. 14.
[9] *Ibid.*, 33.
[10] Prov. xxx. 33.
[11] 1 Cor. ix. 20.
[12] *Ibid.*, 22.
[13] Rom. viii. 9.
[14] John xv. 16.

souls." [15] Make then again a beginning of keeping and guarding the things told thee from me. For it is not time to reveal them yet. Therefore be of good heart in the Lord.

XXVII. Answer of the same Great Old Man to the Same when he was grieved because he had been a long time writing to him, and as a result he supposed that he had cast him out of his memory:—

Write after a time to the brother, first joy and gladness and greeting in the Lord, and say to him—Do not suppose, my beloved, that I had given over thy memory to oblivion from my heart, because of my delay in writing to thee. But giving heed to thy conduct I have been long-suffering until now. But be assured of this, that as God is not forgetful of us, to have mercy on the world, nor am I forgetful of thy love, praying God night and day for the salvation of thy soul, that thou mayest attain to the measure I have prescribed to thee. And learn this, that when thou goest on a service of the Cœnobium, certainly my heart goes with thee, with God's consent. Lose not interest, then, my brother, in any matter. For I hope that all the things I wrote to thee are coming to thee. For God does not lie. For *"He that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved."* [16] Understand what I have said, and what is in store for thee. For *"Through many tribulations must we enter into the kingdom of heaven."* [17] *"Rejoice then in the Lord. Again I say, rejoice."* [18] Let none then learn the secret. For it is written, *"And these words seemed to them as idle tales."* [19] For if a man have not his heart firm, he cannot bear it.

XXVIII. The Same had a mind to decree for himself not to go out anywhere in the fasts. And the Old Man forbade him this, lest when a need according to God required that he should go out, he should be troubled as transgressing the decree:—

Say to the brother—Hast thou not heard from me that wherever thou goest, and whatever thou doest, for God's sake, my heart is with thee? And now, brother, as thou hast heard before, decree nothing for thyself: but if thou goest out when need arises, thou shalt not find trouble in thy thought. Observe then the meaning of the things written to thee from me, and do so, and thou shalt have rest. Peace be unto thee from me, or rather from God.

XXIX. Answer of the Same Great Old Man to the Same, confirming his faith in the things promised him, and by means of such assurance leading him to greater eagerness:—

Say to the brother—Rest, and every good gift, and every divine grace-gift, comes by faith to man. Be not then unperceiving of the power that comes upon thee daily from God through my lowliness. And know that no little marvel marked thy coming unto us. *Run* then towards the prize set

[15] Luke xxi. 19.
[16] Matt. x. 22, etc.
[17] Acts xiv. 22.
[18] Phil. iv. 4.
[19] Luke xxiv. 11.

before thee, that thou mayest *obtain* it. And remember continually from whence God delivered thee, and give Him thanks in all things, praying that He may fulfil His mercy with thee unto the end. Amen.

XXX. Answer of the same Great Old Man to the Same when he asked if he ought to sail with the brethren to Egypt for obtaining handiwork. For he was hesitating because both he and the brethren were without experience of the sea and of the country:—

Say to the brother—So long as thou art without, thou must toil with the brethren. Set then the tribulations of the Apostles before thine eyes. For *he that endureth unto the end, the same shall be saved*,[20] in Christ Jesus our Lord, to whom be the glory unto the ages. Amen.

XXXI. They went about much in Egypt before finding handiwork, and suffered in divers ways much tribulation and distraction: and in consequence loss of interest came upon him. The Old Man foresaw this in the spirit, and prepared him an answer beforehand which ran thus:—

Write, my child, the things said by me, or rather by God, and prepare them to give them to brother John: first, greeting in the Lord: after that, say to him—Why dost thou in tribulations lose interest, like a man of flesh, who has not heard that tribulations await thee—even as the Spirit said to Paul,[21] and then he exhorted those who were with him in the ship, rejoicing.[22] Dost thou not know that *many are the afflictions of the righteous*,[23] and they are proved therein as gold is proved in the fire? If we are righteous, let us be proved in the afflictions. But if again we are sinners, let us be patient as deserving them. For *patience worketh probation*.[24] Let us take in mind all the Saints from the beginning, and see what they endured. Both doing good and speaking good, and standing in all truth, they were being hated and afflicted by men unto their end, and were *praying for* their enemies and *those who despitefully used* them,[25] according to the saying of the Saviour. Hast thou also then been sold like the worshipful Joseph, and have thy *hands served in the basket?*[26] and hast thou gone down into two pits?[27] Or like Moses hast thou suffered ill from boyhood to old age? What hast thou endured, thou slothful one? Like David, who was pursued by Saul, and by his own son, unto death, and mourned for them when they died? Or like Jonah, hast thou been cast into the sea? Lethargic and beloved, why is thy thought fainting? Be not afraid nor in dread as unmanly, lest thou come short of the promises of God. Be not frightened like an unbeliever, but give courage to thy thoughts of little faith. Love afflictions in all things, that thou mayest become a proven son of the Saints. Remember the patience of Job and of those who came after

[20] Matt. x. 22, etc.
[21] Acts xx. 23.
[22] *Ibid.*, xxvii. 22, 33.
[23] Ps. xxxiv. (xxxiii.) 19.
[24] Rom. v. 4.
[25] Luke vi. 28.
[26] Ps. lxxxi. (lxxx.) 6.
[27] Gen. xxxvii. and xl. 15.

him, and be zealous to come into their footsteps. Remember what Paul endured, dangers and afflictions and hunger and bonds and a multitude of other ills, and say to thy pusillanimity, "I am a stranger unto thee." Remember me who have written to thee; and whether the matter prosper before thee or not, give thanks unto God. Observe that matters are corruptible and passing away, but patience according to God saves him who has got it. Behold thou art struggling to bring handiwork and work at it. Let me then show thee the apostolic word, that *it is not of him that willeth nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy.*[28] Behold, God is sending you men who have the world's need. Receive them, and do not tell them that I said anything about them, lest they should catch vainglory. Love them as true brothers, and make your thought give rest to their thought. For they despise the world, desiring to save their souls. And God, writing by me according to foreknowledge, is leading them here to you, that you may learn that they have altogether despised the world. Do thou then, brother, held by my hand, walk in *the strait and narrow way that leadeth unto life* eternal,[29] in Christ Jesus our Lord, to whom be the glory unto the ages. Amen.

XXXII. Answer of the same Great Old Man to the Same when he asked if he ought to eat by himself, and if he must not come down on Wednesdays and Fridays to Holy Communion, and if it is necessary for him to leave the care of works; and should it happen that he should fall sick in his quiet, if he should employ some treatment; so that commandments might be given him unto salvation:—

I do not want thy love to be ignorant about the benefit that is coming to pass with thee from the loving-kind God. For indeed, behold, the pangs have arrived, and Jesus has begun to do with thee, and to introduce thee in order into His blessed quiet, and into the patience that needeth not to be ashamed. Even, then, if debility or other sickness follow upon thee, cast all thy hope upon thy Master, and thou wilt have rest. For indeed I hope in my God that thou art not far from the way of God. But concerning eating alone in thy cell—it is best for thee, and profitable. But if occasion arise for eating also with the brethren, do not hesitate or take it ill: and little by little draw thyself in. As for Communion—so long as thou comest in and goest out, prevent it not: for the matter may cause offence to others. And give heed how thou makest thy settling in lowliness and fear of God and love to all without hypocrisy, and *buildest* thy *house upon the* firm and unshakable *rock.*[30] For it says, *"And that rock was Christ."*[31] But concerning some other commandments—at present there is no need. Enough has been written to thee from me. For they have sufficiency to lead thee from a novice to a perfect man. Meditate them, and remember them, and forget not. For they contain the whole library. Have strength in the Lord continually, being of humble mind in words and deeds and motions.

[28] Rom. ix. 16.
[29] Matt. vii. 14.
[30] Matt. vii. 24.
[31] 1 Cor. x. 4.

XXXIII. Answer of the same Great Old Man to the Same when his brother according to the flesh was considering withdrawing to the monastic life, and asked the Old Man about it by way of him:—

Our Lord Jesus Christ said, "*No man cometh unto me except the heavenly Father draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day.*[32] *And I will manifest myself unto him.*"[33] See "*that the fields are white unto harvest. And he that reapeth receiveth wages, and gathereth fruit unto life eternal: that he that reapeth may rejoice, and he that soweth. For herein is the saying true, One soweth and another reapeth.*"[34] Brother, no one desiring to go into the city sleeps. And no one desiring to work, is idle when he sees the sun. And no one desiring to tidy up his field is careless. For he who desires to go into the city, will walk quickly before it grows late. And he who sees the sun will go out to his work with speed lest he should be hindered. And he who desires to tidy up his field, will make haste before it is corrupted with rust. *He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.*[35]

XXXIV. When his brother came to him again a second time, he was troubled for his salvation, and reminded him of his former promise. But he asked for a sign to be given him about this from the Old Man. And the Old Man declared thus:—

But about the brother of whom thou spakest—unbelief is making war upon him. And this is the sect of the Pharisees, to whom the Lord said, "*This generation seeketh after a sign, and there shall no sign be given to it.*"[36] I have nothing to say to him but as the Apostle says, "*The old things are passed away: behold, all things are become new,*"[37] and "*Now, O Israel,*"[38] and "*Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God,*"[39] and "*To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts.*"[40] *He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.*[41] Pray for me.

XXXV. Answer of the same Great Old Man to the Same, when he asked about brethren who were sick in body, and about others sick in thought, if he ought to take them to be with himself; and if he must tell the Abbot to lighten the novices a little from the vigil; and about his long silence:—

Brother, the answer to the three thoughts is one—Do not force the will, but sow in hope. For our Lord also never forced any man, but preached the Gospel, and whoever would listened. I know that thou knowest that I am not careless of thy love, nor despise it. But the forbearance is for the best. For even when we pray, and *God is long-suffering*[42] over

[32] John vi. 44.
[33] John xiv. 21.
[34] John iv. 35–37.
[35] Luke viii. 8.
[36] Luke xi. 29, Matt. xii. 39.
[37] 2 Cor. v. 17.
[38] Deut. iv. 1, x. 12.
[39] Deut. vi. 16, Matt. iv. 7.
[40] Ps. xcv. (xciv.) 8, Heb. iii. 8.
[41] Luke viii. 8, etc.
[42] Luke xviii. 7.

hearing, He does it for the best, that we may learn long-suffering, and may not grow weary, saying "We have prayed and we have not been heard." For God knows what is best for man. Mayest thou rejoice in the Lord, my brother: and be care-free from everything; and pray for me, my beloved twin soul.

XXXVI. Answer of the same Great Old Man to the Same, permitting him to begin his quiet in all freedom from care: and in answer to the thought that had come upon him that it is the last hour: and because having conversed with one of the fathers for a long hour, he bethought him whether he had done well or no:—

Brother, hear from me who love thee in Christ Jesus. About the cell—Our Lord Jesus Christ said, "*The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live. For as the Father hath life in himself, even so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself.*"[43] And I say to thee, the time for thy entry is come, with God's help. Establish thy new cell, and enter therein having God for guide. And when thou art settled, have no care for anything at all. For indeed the need of matters and the proving calls itself. But concerning the thought sown in thee—it is idle, bringing in with it vain-glory. For who does not know that we are in the last hour? But about the talk—when thou seest thyself almost talking theology, know that silence is more wonderful and more glorious than that. Anything further, then, thou hast no need that I should write to thee. For I have written to thee from Alpha to Omega, as thy love knows well. Therefore I commit thee to God. For His is the help and the mercy. Amen.

[*To be continued.*]

MOUNT ATHOS:

A CRITICISM OF FR. BASIL KRIVOCHEINE'S PAPER

(We publish here the substance of an article which appeared in the Greek periodical, Ἐκκλησία, March 15th, 1953, under the title "Inaccuracies about the Holy Mountain." And we add a reply from Fr. Krivocheine which will, we hope, satisfy his critics.)

IN the Autumn, 1952, number of *The Christian East* an article was published bearing the signature of the Hieromonk Basil Krivocheine, about the Holy Mountain.

In this article, Fr. Krivocheine alleges that those in the West who occupy themselves with the Holy Mountain, have fallen, in their publications on this subject, into errors which would never be tolerated on any other subject. But the Holy Mountain, the writer adds, is, in the West at least, unknown, and in consequence the inexactitudes recorded pass unobserved.

But Krivocheine himself has fallen into errors of this kind.

He attributes to St. Athanasius the purpose of giving to the Holy Mountain an inter-orthodox character, basing this opinion on the fact that he "attracted to Mount Athos—monks from all parts of the Christian world," including Iberia and Amalfi.

[43] John v. 25-26.

We do not think it probable that St. Athanasius would have had the inter-orthodox ideas attributed to him, at least in the sense given to the term " inter-orthodox " by the writer of the article. Certainly the presence of Amalfitan and Iberian monks on the Holy Mountain does not justify Krivocheine's views on the subject. In fact, a Byzantinist of the standing of the Hieromonk ought to have had in view the fact that Iberia (Georgia), though she was autonomous and had native kings, recognized in greater or less degree the sovereignty of the Greek Emperors, and from the time of Leo, son of Basil the Macedonian, the King of Georgia bore also the Byzantine title of Curopalates. Apart from this, in 991 David the King of Iberia left his kingdom by will to Basil the Macedonian. It follows that we are concerned with a country which was closely bound up with the Byzantine Empire. On the other side, Amalfi was subject to the Byzantine Empire, as is recorded by J. B. Bury (*A History of the Eastern Roman Empire*, in 1912, p. 312) " Gaeta and Amalfi belonged nominally to the Duchy of Naples, and like Naples, to the Eastern Empire."

We are not concerned, then, with monks coming " from all parts of the Christian world," as the writer of the article affirms, but from parts of the Byzantine Empire, or a country closely linked to it and subject to its suzerainty. If in a monastery in England, e.g., there were monks coming from English Colonies, or from powers belonging to the British Commonwealth, would that monastery be described as having an international character?

Finally, it is to be noted that the Monastery of the Amalfitans was founded before the Schism, and after the Schism the monks died out, and the monastery ceased to exist.

Going on to examine the evolution of the position on the Holy Mountain after the Liberation, and from the time when it became part of the Kingdom of Greece, the Hieromonk asks why, when before 1914 the monasteries there numbered about 10,000 monks, to-day these amount to about 2,000.

In the opinion of the writer, this is due in part at least to the fact that after the First World War the Holy Mountain was cut off from Russia, and after the Second, from all the other Orthodox powers.

As Fr. Basil admits here, conditions of life on the Holy Mountain are very hard, and demand an exceptional attachment to the monastic life, such as to-day has died out, or at least is seriously diminished, generally in all Christian countries. On the other hand, it is to be noted that it is not only the number of foreign monks on Athos that has been diminished, but also that of the Greeks. And this diminution is observed in the monasteries of all the powers in general.

It is an inaccuracy that the Hellenic Government interposed difficulties in the way of the manning of the monasteries of the Holy Mountain, by purposely excluding foreigners. It only practises, as it has the right to do, a test of those who seek such candidature. The writer of the article certainly knows that appeals of the foreign monks to the League of Nations (in 1932 and 1933) on this subject were rejected by that international organization, which recognized the justice of the views of the Greek Government on this subject, declaring these to be in absolute agreement with its international undertakings relative to the Holy Mountain.

On the other hand, we ask the Hieromonk Basil what are the Powers of the free world which accept without examination the establishment in their countries of persons coming from the communist Powers.

It is to be noted that by force of the Greek Constitution, and Art. 6 of the Statutory Charter of the Holy Mountain, those who are enrolled as novices or monks in the monasteries of Athos, claim Greek citizenship by right: and this justifies still more whatever reservations the Greek Government may have in regard to their establishment on the Holy Mountain.

Further, the Hieromonk records the shortage of education, of novices and of monks, which is found on the Holy Mountain. Clearly the writer of the article forgets that Greece has gone through two wars, has undergone a triple occupation, and after her liberation still had to face new struggles; while on the other hand her budget has been so heavy that only with American help has she been able to answer to her most imperative necessities: and in consequence there has been a slowness in the return to functioning of the Athonite School.

It is now purposed that this School should function, and so fill the gap created by *force majeure* in the education of the monks of Athos. At this School, apart from courses in Theology, History, etc., Agriculture and Forestry will be taught—thus providing the monks with the ability to exploit the sources of wealth found in the Peninsula, and to face with greater hope of success the economic problem which seriously occupies the monasteries.

Fr. Basil also stresses that the Holy Mountain, confined to one nation (obviously the Greek), is destined to gradual decay. But the desire of the Greek Government has certainly not been to exclude the admission of foreign monks—under the prior condition, of course, that these desired sincerely to become monks, and to give themselves exclusively to their monastic duties.

The reasons which have sometimes compelled the Greek Government to diverge from this principle, and take definite measures against foreign monks, are to be found in the lately published *Actes de la Conférence des Eglises Autocephales Orthodoxes à Moscou*, 1948 (tom. II, pp. 340–60)—a Conference certainly not inspired with philhellenic sentiments. In these Acts, speaking in the Commission in regard to the Holy Mountain, Bishop Benjamin stressed that opposition to foreigners on Mount Athos was provoked by the chauvinism of the non-Greek monks, and especially the Russians. This attitude of the foreigners, the Bishop further said, compelled at an earlier date even the Patriarch Joachim III himself, who was known in other matters for the width of his views, to take the measures defined on October 31st, 1911, in support of the Greek monks.

Still the same Bishop records further, that if the paragraph which concerns the Holy Mountain in Article 62 of the Treaty of Berlin, took such an indefinite form, this was due to the intervention of Lord Salisbury, who saw political aims in the objectives on Athos of Ignatiev, the Russian Ambassador in Constantinople.

At the same Conference the Bulgarian Archimandrite Methodius spoke on this subject at still greater length, saying (*ibid.*, p. 351) that Lord Salis-

bury considered that Russia was pursuing "military aims" on the Holy Mountain, and brought up the case of two Russian officers who had embraced the monastic life in a monastery on the Holy Mountain. The British Government shared and supported these views at the Congress of Berlin.

It is easy to defame the Greek Administration on the Holy Mountain, especially when writing for a milieu which is of necessity completely ignorant of the agreements there established. The Greek Government never pursued the aim of prohibiting foreign Orthodox from becoming monks in the monasteries of Athos: but it is disposed to allow this only under the prior conditions recorded above.

D.S.

FR. BASIL KRIVOCHEINE'S REPLY

As regards my essay—my object in writing it was to make a historical review of the spiritual life of the Holy Mountain in the past, and an examination of its present-day position in the spiritual life of the Orthodox Church in general. Consequently I occupied myself especially with the two most significant epochs in the spiritual history of the Holy Mountain—that of the Hesychasts in the 14th century, and that of the "Collyvades" in the 18th. And I tried to study the phenomenon of "Athonite Mysticism," and the special contribution of Athonite monasticism to the spiritual treasury of Orthodoxy.

Such a systematic study of Athonite Spirituality has not yet been written from the Orthodox side. And my present endeavour must be considered as simply an attempt to fill this gap. Consequently I should be sincerely grateful for any objective criticism. Unfortunately I do not find this in the article in Ἐκκλησία. For the writer passes over in complete silence the main content of my study—does not find it necessary to record even the title, "Mount Athos in the Spiritual Life of the Orthodox Church"—and occupies himself exclusively with certain very small points in the final part of my work, where I examine the manifold causes of the present-day spiritual crisis in Athonite monasticism. In this way the real character of the study is altered, and an inaccurate impression is created in the mind of the reader who does not know it in its entirety. It is quite untrue that in it I defame the Greek Administration. I simply record facts, and am only sorry that in consequence of restrictive measures of the Greek authorities (a fact which the writer of the article does not dispute) the rate of diminution in numbers of the monks in the non-Greek monasteries of the Holy Mountain has been accelerated. All the same I do not give a primary significance to this factor, but also examine in detail other deeper and more general causes of the steep decline in the population of Athos observed in the last decades. Certainly I could not pass over in complete silence the part played also by these measures, since in a scientific study all the causes of a phenomenon should be examined, and there cannot be allowed either omissions or exaggerations to suit the purpose of the writer.

I am sorry that the writer of the article, in spite of his promise to indicate the errors into which I have fallen, confines himself only to the case of

St. Athanasius, saying that the Saint did not attract monks "from all parts of the Christian world," but only from the Byzantine Empire, and that Georgia was not an independent power, but dependent on Byzantium. Only it is not I who say that St. Athanasius attracted with his holiness and spiritual experience monks from all parts of the Christian world; it is his contemporary biographer who says so, and considers it as his greatest glory. Why then does the writer of the article want to confine the radiation of St. Athanasius within the limits of the Byzantine Empire? As for Georgia —it is an anachronism to employ terms of recent international law, like "independent" and "dependent," in reference to the Byzantine epoch. The Christian world—in the East at least—formed then a single whole with Constantinople for centre, without its being possible to speak of relations of political dependence between its different parts. The Princes of Moscow used to bear, up to the 15th century, titles of the Byzantine Court, without being politically subject to Constantinople. Besides, were there not also living in community on the Holy Mountain monks from the parts of the East under Arab rule, as is witnessed by the nomenclature of the Monasteries? At the same time it is not correct that I attribute to St. Athanasius "inter-orthodox" views. I do not employ the term "inter-orthodox" at all in my study: and I can add that I also reject it as not reconcilable with the unitive character of the Church. I find especially unfortunate its employment in regard to the Holy Mountain, which has belonged from the first exclusively to the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. I only say that already in the epoch of St. Athanasius, and on from that, the Holy Mountain was established as a *pan*-Orthodox centre of monasticism, and that this is also its mission, and an indispensable condition of its spiritual prosperity and of its very existence. But I add that the supernational composition of Athonite monasticism does not deprive the Holy Mountain as a whole of its properly Greek character which it has had from the first (p. 47).

With such additions and subtractions, the writer of the article has perhaps succeeded in creating in those who have not read my study the impression that they are concerned with an anti-Hellenic publication. But I am sure that every one who reads it will take away the assurance that my study was written with love for the Holy Mountain, for the Orthodox spiritual life, and for the beautiful Greek-Christian civilization of Byzantium. Besides, the very fact that my essay was welcomed by that most philhellenic English periodical *The Christian East*, constitutes a proof that, to the eyes of the distinguished editors, it did not have any anti-Hellenic colour.

Hieromonk Basil Krivocheine.

PROFESSOR L. A. ZANDER'S REPLY TO FR. G. FLOROVSKY

POLEMICS are always unpleasant, but in the present case they are unavoidable, if only out of respect for those who have received my book favourably. Foremost among them are the Bishop of Chichester (to whose help I am indebted for the publication of the book), the Rev. O.

Tomkins (who wrote about it in the *Ecumenical Review*), authors of reviews in *Theology*, the *Eastern Churches Quarterly*, *Worship*, *The Student Movement*, *Blackfriars*, and many others. Their reports were extremely kind and I am grateful to them both for the attention they have given to my work and for their valuable criticism of it; and indeed I would gladly accept the severest critical remarks, if they really referred to what I have written and not to fantastic assertions wrongly ascribed to me. But the Rev. G. Florovsky's article cannot even be called a critical review: it is founded on misrepresentation and is a mere diatribe. In consequence, it is difficult to say anything in reply to it. How am I to disprove the assertion that my book is "treacherous, misleading, untimely, reactionary, and anti-ecumenical"? How am I to clear myself of the charge of being an ignoramus in theology and history, and incapable of either love or suffering (I am said to enjoy my suffering!)? At times Fr. Florovsky indulges in simple abuse and talks of my "antiquated platitudes."

I do not propose to deal with his evaluation of *Vision and Action* but will confine myself to the methods he uses against me. He appears to be expounding my ideas, but in truth he systematically distorts them and ascribes to me things which I have not and could not have said. He draws absurd conclusions from those distortions and thus produces a ridiculous caricature of my book.

I cannot point out all his distortions—this would take up more pages than the actual review. My book itself is an answer to him. If any of my readers are sufficiently interested, I would ask them to open the book on pages indicated by him, and they will see for themselves that I assert something very different from what he imputes to me—often, indeed, the very opposite of it. It is not true that in my opinion the East and the West *must* be divided and that this division of the Christian world is final and inevitable. It is not true that I regard every agreement as dangerous and undesirable. It is not true that I propose "to cut across the confessions and to start a new ecumenical communion." It is not true that I "deliberately reject all dogmas, canons, Dominical institutions as 'human accretions' or even 'superstitions'" (the reviewer puts these words in quotation marks). It is not true that I profess Orthodoxy simply because I happen to have been born in a Russian Orthodox family. I have always declared that I belong to the Orthodox Church consciously and by conviction. It is not true that abstention from proselytizing prevents me from bearing witness to the truth in which I believe. It is not true that I assert "the equality of conflicting doctrines." It is not true that for me "Christendom replaces the Church." And so on, and so on.

The Rev. G. Florovsky ascribes to me not only all these monstrosities but also ideas against which I have fought all my life both in print and by word of mouth—and he knows this perfectly well, because for 25 years we worked side by side. Thus he writes that for me "'ecumenical communion' has a deeper insight into the ultimate mystery of God than any 'institutional' church or denomination can ever attain, being imprisoned in the narrow limits of 'dogmas, canons and rites'" (p. 211). I would ask my readers to open p. 211 of my book: they will not find in it anything of

the kind! The words 'dogmas and canons' (which the reviewer puts in quotation marks, adding the word 'rites') occur at the end of the page in quite a different connection: I say there that a theoretical knowledge of a church's dogmas and canons does not give us sufficient insight into it and that a living experience of its prayer is necessary. On p. 77 I quote a resolution of the W.S.C.F. which says "we believe that the ecumenical work can be spiritually successful only in so far as the participants in it are conscious of the dogmas, and faithful to the tradition of their own church . . . ." Fr. Florovsky knows that it was I who drew up this resolution and that I have for years fought in the W.S.C.F. for the dogmatic, as against the interconfessional, principle. He also knows that I regard Orthodox dogma both as the norm of religious faith and as the source of inspiration of philosophical thought and culture.[1] Why then does he impute to me the very reverse of what I believe? Why does he refer to p. 211 and quote words chosen at random and taken out of their context? He uses this method throughout: taking a sentence, or even a part of one, from my book, he puts it in quotation marks, thus creating an impression of authenticity, adds a few words of his own—and forthwith ascribes the resulting absurdity to me—evidently, in the hope that a trustful reader will not verify his statements. I feel bitterly ashamed of having to accuse, on the pages of a theological journal, a Christian theologian of actions which I do not want to call by their real name.

In the Rev. G. Florovsky's exposition not only my ideas but even the words I use lose their original meaning. For instance, I say that "my church is naturally regarded by me as the true Church"; he picks out the word "naturally," makes a whole theory out of it and, arguing against it, remarks that "the real question is not what is natural to me, but what is true." Or again, I say that the growing sense of the unity and solidarity of all Christians does not create the one Christian Church (for it does not exist)—meaning one Church which includes *all* Christians; the Rev. G. Florovsky construes this into an ecclesiological heresy and says that "for the author one Christian Church simply does not exist."

Sometimes Fr. Florovsky does actually quote my ideas but declares them to be fallacious; the surprising thing is however that in his own writings he puts forward exactly the same ideas as unquestionably true. Thus, in his review he says that "the antithesis of West and East belongs more to the polemical and publicistic phraseology than to sober historical thinking," but in his article *The Problems of Christian reunion* (*Put* N. 37, pp. 11–12) he writes: "not to feel the seriousness of the division and disagreement between East and West is truly dangerous. It is a kind of mystical insensibility, and is the source of crude over-simplification in the plans and projects of union." He sternly denounces my pessimistic attitude to the reunion of the churches, but his own attitude in this respect is even more pessimistic than mine; at the Amsterdam Conference he said to the interviewer representing the French magazine *Réforme:* "The differences between Orthodoxy and Protestantism are dogmatic; they are a matter of faith. With

[1] See my article *Logic and Dogma* in the Journal of the Orthodox Theological Institute in Paris.

regard to them (especially with regard to Apostolic succession) agreement between us can *never* be reached" (italics in the text).[2] He condemns my eschatological point of view and says that I "disbelieve in the possibility of any ecumenical advance on the level of history" (this is not so! my whole book bears witness to the contrary, L.Z.). "One is invited to indulge in a sort of eschatological vision and there is no call to sober and responsible action." But in his article on *Reunion* in *Put* (mentioned above) he writes: "Reunion is possible only in spirit and in truth, in inspiration and holiness. Therefore it is not likely to be reached at theological conferences, at congresses of hierarchs, hardly in Lausanne and certainly not in Stockholm. And if reunion is destined to take place in history, it can only be in eschatological twilight, on the eve of *Parousia*. It will be an anticipation and foretaste of the destinies beyond this æon."[3]

The Rev. G. Florovsky does not find a single thing to commend in my book (and, consequently, in my work, since the book sums it up). Everything in it is said to be un-Orthodox, anti-ecumenical, false, pernicious and dangerous. Why in that case had he not denounced me before? My ecumenical convictions were not formed yesterday. The first sketch of *Vision and Action* was published as an article in 1936 under the title *The Essence of the Ecumenical Movement* in Russian, English, French, German and Dutch. It was followed by articles *What is Unity?* (1939), *The Meaning of "Ut omnes unum sint"* (1943), *The Problem of Ecumenism* (1948), and several others. In all these articles I developed the same ideas as in *Vision and Action*. If those ideas are so dangerous, why has he not issued his warning sooner? Is it simply because my book "was unfortunately favourably received in many ecumenical quarters?"

The Rev. G. Florovsky's article is written with a kind of inspired vindictiveness and is aimed at discrediting both me and my book. But leaving aside polemics and self-defence, I should like to make clear what is the real difference between his attitude to ecumenism and mine.

I take as my starting point the ecumenical experience which forms a *religious* bond between Christians of different denominations and convictions. Therein lies the painful paradoxality of ecumenism. "We form a community to disagree; we unite to face our divisions," writes the Rev. O. Tomkins in *The Wholeness of the Church* (p. 14). (Florovsky does not protest against this, although Tomkins's position is closely akin to mine.)

The Rev. G. Florovsky's conception of ecumenism is very different. He writes[4]: "To participate in the Ecumenical Movement means for me to take part in ecumenical *Conversation* (italics in the text). . . . The part played by the Orthodox in the Ecumenical Movement should be conceived in the categories of missionary activity." The problem of ecumenism is thus reduced to nought. Conversation and missionary work do not imply that your listeners are Christians, involve no inter-Christian problems, and avoid all the difficulties of being one in Christ and yet divided in faith. But

[2] *Réforme* 1948, September 11, N. 182.
[3] This sentence is quoted in *Vision and Action* (p. 83).
[4] *Participation of the Orthodox in the Ecumenical Movement* in the Journal of the West-European Orthodox exarchate, May, 1949.

when Fr. Florovsky leads in prayer at ecumenical conferences (as he did at Edinburgh and Lund), does he regard this as mere "conversation"? When he takes part in decisions made by the most responsible organs of the World Council of Churches, obviously assuming his share of responsibility for the ecumenical policy as a whole, does he regard this too as merely "missionary activity"?

Apparently ecumenism is not a matter of religious experience for Fr. Florovsky, and he denies that it may be that for others. This is why he calls my standpoint romantic and emotional; he explains that which I regard as a Divine gift—the brotherhood in Christ with members of other denominations—by the fact that I am "impressed by the friendliness of the encounter."

The ecumenical paradox cannot be solved in logical terms. In saying this I am not "sacrificing reason" or "diluting" my faith. I merely put certain limits to reason and guard myself against theological rationalism which seeks to include all divine mysteries within the framework of human words. Ecumenism is and has always been for me a Divine gift transcending my understanding, a spiritual reality in which poor human efforts are crowned with a new and unexpected joy of brotherhood in Christ. The purpose of my book was to give expression to that miraculous experience, and not to preach anything. And in any case I am not guilty of passivity or of a desire to destroy the very possibility of ecumenism. I hope this is obvious to every one who has read *Vision and Action*.

L. ZANDER.

[Fr. Florovsky's review has, as we had hoped, called forth from Professor Zander an explicit repudiation of some attitudes which had been attributed to him—especially of the charge that he was setting "Christendom," or "Ecumenical Communion" above the Church. And it is to be recognized that in a number of passages the review seems seriously to misrepresent the book. For instance, it quotes phrases from Professor Zander's advocacy of "non-proselytizing" as if it were treated as an absolute principle that every one should stay where he is. But the important passage (p. 116) is overlooked in which it is admitted that there are cases in which "remaining in one's own Church may become spiritually impossible."

On the other hand, a large proportion of the quotations in the review do represent fairly, though rejecting, what the book says and means to say. And here the cleavage between our two friends seems real. To take one example—it is true that Professor Zander says that the Pantokrator of the Byzantine ikon, and Ude's Galilean, are images of the same Christ. And we must ask whether in fact he means that there is no limit to this principle, no such thing as a *false* picture of Christ, or a *false* way of holiness, which it is the duty of every true lover of Christ, and even of the Ecumenical Movement, to reject with abhorrence. Perhaps Professor Zander is here overstressing one side of his case as a challenge, to set us thinking. But if so, it was the duty of an Orthodox reviewer to take up the challenge.

We would urge readers to study the book for themselves, and form their own judgments.—ED.]

LETTER

DEAR MR. EDITOR,

In sending you my reply to the Rev. G. Florovsky's misleading review of my book *Vision and Action* I should like to answer your remarks upon it as well. I should of course feel much happier if my explanations had been published in the same number of *The Christian East* as the attack upon me; now, six months after, the readers have no doubt forgotten most of the arguments and merely retain the general impression that there is something wrong with my book. But in any case I must reply.

You write: "We find it hard to understand how an Orthodox writer can loyally say (p. 30) that the one Christian Church *does not exist*." It should not be necessary for me to remind you of the elementary rule of logic that the meaning of a proposition depends on the context. What I said on p. 30 is this: "Summing up the matter in psychological terms it may be said that under the influence of the Movement the sense of unity and solidarity of all Christians is growing irresistibly apace in the modern world. It is not correct to speak of the one Christian Church (for it does not exist), but one may speak of the one Christian world, of all Christendom—*tota Christianitas*—which, in spite of its dogmatic contradictions and indefiniteness, embraces all who bear the name of Christ . . ." It is obvious that the words "it does not exist" (which are in brackets and therefore have no meaning apart from the rest of the sentence) refer to the idea of a single Christian Church embracing all Christian denominations. My meaning is that the organization, or fellowship, or whatever else we may call it, which comes into being as a result of ecumenical work is not entitled to be called a Church. A gathering of all Christians who disagree in their ideas and beliefs is not a Church. The truth of this is clearly grasped and formulated by the World Council of Churches, but in ecumenical practice the term "Church" is constantly misused. My parenthetic remark is simply a protest against this abuse, but you take the phrase out of its context, italicize it and interpret it as an ecclesiological heresy. A Freudian would probably regard this as proof of an unconscious bias, but I am only surprised at your ascribing to me, whom you have known for twenty years, an idea which is utterly foreign to me.

You go on to say that "the verdict on the book" must depend on our agreement or disagreement with Fr. Florovsky's remark that "it is precisely this spirit of penitence that is missing in the book." But my book is not a moral call—it is an inquiry into the problem of ecumenism. Calls to an unspecified repentance in which ecumenical literature abounds have always seemed to me to conceal, under cover of pious rhetoric, a desire (perhaps an unconscious one) to avoid the problem itself. May I ask, what kind of penitence do you miss in my book? Obviously repentance of my personal sins, ready as I am to offer it, is not relevant to the subject. Repentance offered by a church body for historical sins of the past is also irrelevant to the point at issue. It may have good moral effects, but it does not go to the root of the matter. Thus, penitential services held by the Roman Catholic church in France for the massacre of St. Bartholomew's were undoubtedly a comfort to the Protestants, but have done nothing to bring Calvin's

doctrine closer to that of St. Thomas Aquinas. And yet the fundamental problem of ecumenism is that Calvinists follow Calvin, and Catholics St. Thomas, and neither can feel penitent about it. When I am told that in order to end disunity we must repent, I answer that in the last resort disunity is due to the fact that some Christians profess Orthodoxy, others Lutheranism, others the Baptist tenets, and so on. I cannot repent of being Orthodox, and the same thing applies to Christians of other confessions.

The ambiguity of the call to repentance becomes even more obvious at ecumenical conferences. The usual stumbling block is the impossibility of intercommunion. And so we are told: repent! (meaning, repent of your exclusiveness and intolerance)—repent, and then we shall be able to communicate together!

I resolutely protest against thus replacing dogmatic consciousness by psychological moralizing. Such a call to repentance may be, and often is, a call to dogmatic compromise. This should not be forgotten.

If, however, you mean by penitence a different mentality, a change of attitude—in fact, all the positive attainments of the Ecumenical Movement, my whole book is devoted to this theme. Look especially at pp. 20–25, and you will find a description of this spiritual *metanoia*.

Your third remark concerns the philosophical problem of method and is of particular interest to me. You accuse me of a "propensity to Hegelian dichotomies." I think you are wrong there. I always strive to think in the category of "in so far as," and not of "either—or." I would remind you that dichotomy is a binary division based on the absence of some quality, and therefore limits the subject under investigation to two contradictory and incompatible attributes. In contradistinction to it, the category of "in so far as" presupposes a number of transitional stages standing to one another in the relation of partial compatibility. The dogmatic presuppositions of negation and of its bearing upon other kinds of judgments are discussed in my article *Logic and Dogmatics* in the Journal *Pravoslavnaya Mysl* (the Orthodox thought) published by the Orthodox Theological Academy in Paris.

I am yours very sincerely

L. ZANDER.

[We are thankful to have Professor Zander's reassurance that his statement that the one Christian Church "does not exist" is to be taken in its context and not absolutely. At the same time, we do not feel that, even taken in its context, the unqualified form of the statement was justified. Also, if we do in any sense believe in One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church on earth, then, whatever the visible community with which we identify it, we must surely believe that to be a Christian is to be linked to it in some fashion, however tenuous the links. For it is the Body of Christ, and to be a Christian is to draw one's life from that Body.—ED.]

REVIEWS AND PERIODICALS RECEIVED

Aktines (Athens), monthly.

Catholica Unio (Roman Catholic) Fribourg, monthly.

Dans l'Esprit et la Vérité (Chrétiens Orthodoxes des pays de langue française), monthly.

Eastern Churches Quarterly (Roman Catholic), Vol. X, 1 & 2.

Ecumenical Review (World Council of Churches), July, 1953, No. 4.

Gregorios ho Palamas (Saloniki), March–April, 1953.

Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift (Berne), January–March, 1953.

International Review of Missions, January–March, 1953.

Irénikon, Tome XXV, 1° & 2° trimestre, 1953.

Le Messager (Paris), Action Chrétienne des Etudiants Russes, 2 monthly.

Nea Sion (Jerusalem), January–March, 1953.

One Church (Russian U.S.A.), monthly.

Oriente Christiano (Roman Catholic, Madrid), monthly.

Orthodoxia (Œc. Patriarchate), January, February, March, 1953.

Proche-Orient Chrétien (Roman Catholic, Palestine), Tome 4, Fasc. 1.

St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly (New York), Vol. I, No. 1.

St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary Bulletin, 1952–3.

Sobornost, Series 3, No. 13.

Syndesmos (Paris), June, 1953.

Zoe (Athens), July, 1953.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY THE FAITH PRESS, LTD., LEIGHTON BUZZARD